SHOUT
SHARE
IT

ZS 2702

BOUND
2 4 APR 1987

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

VOLUME 42

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
c/o British Museum (Natural History) Cromwell Road
London SW7 5BD

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

VOLUME 42

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publication Office,
c/o British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road,
London SW7 5BD
1985

(All rights reserved)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology 1

Special Announcements 3

Hyla lactea Daudin, 1803 (Amphibia). A. F. Stimson 6

Nymphula Schrank, 1802 (Insecta, Lepidoptera), W. Speidel. 7

Laspeyresia Hübner, [1825] (Insecta, Lepidoptera). R. W. Hodges; W. E. Miller; J. D. Bradley, W. G. Tremewan, K. Tuck & C. J. Hamilton. 8

Zygaena anthyllidis Boisduval, 1828 (Insecta, Lepidoptera). Secretary . 10

On the proposed amendment to Article 51c of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. J. C. Cokendolpher, O. F. Francke & D. Quintero Jn.. 10

On the proposed amendment to Article 70b of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. C. W. Wright 12

Bagrus Bosc, 1816 (Pisces, Siluriformes). W. R. Taylor 14

Opinion 1288. *Sphinx tipuliformis* Clerck, 1759 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) . 17

Opinion 1289. *Mesoplodon* Gervais, 1850 (Mammalia, Cetacea) . . . 19

Opinion 1290. *Leptinotarsa* Chevrolat, 1837 (Insecta, Coleoptera). . . 21

Opinion 1291. *Antilope zebra* Gray, 1838 (Mammalia) 24

Opinion 1292. *Voluta papilio* Link, 1807 (Gastropoda) 27

Opinion 1293. *Scolia quinquecincta* Fabricius, 1793 (Insecta, Hymenoptera) 29

Opinion 1294. *Edwardsia* de Quatrefages, 1841 (Coelenterata, Actiniaria) 31

Opinion 1295. *Actinia* Linnaeus, 1767, ACTINIIDAE Rafinesque, 1815 (Coelenterata, Actiniaria) and *Pentacta* Goldfuss, 1820 (Echinodermata, Holothurioidea). 34

Opinion 1296. *Nettastomella* Carpenter, 1865 (Bivalvia) 37

Opinion 1297. *Xenocrepis pura* Mayr, 1904 (Insecta, Hymenoptera) . . 39

Direction 116. PAPILIONIDAE Latreille, [1802] (Insecta, Lepidoptera) . . 41

Direction 117. Correction of Entry No. 462 in the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology concerning *Sphaerium* Scopoli, 1777 (Mollusca, Bivalvia). (Correction to Opinion 94) 43

Spiroglyphus Daudin, 1800 and *Stoa* De Serres, 1855 (Mollusca, Gastropoda, Vermetidae). A. Myra Keen & M. G. Hadfield . . 46

Carpophaga aurorae Peale, 1848 and *Serresius galeatus* Bonaparte (Aves). M. D. Bruce, D. T. Holyoak & J.-C. Thibault 50

Humerobates Sellnick, 1928 (Arachnida, Acari). R. A. Norton 54

Hatschekia Poche, 1902 (Crustacea, Copepoda). J. B. Jones 57

Description of new taxa based on enzyme data. J. E. Jelnes; R. Fortuner. 60

Authorship and dates of the Sowerbys' Mineral Conchology of Great Britain. C. W. Wright & R. J. Cleevely 64

Hymenolepis Weinland, 1858 (Cestoda). The Secretary 72

Echinococcus Rudolphi, 1801 (Cestoda). The Secretary 74

Anoplocephala Blanchard, 1848 (Cestoda) The Secretary 76

Homonymy in the families HARPIDAE Hawle & Corda, 1847 (Trilobita) and HARPIDAE Bronn, 1849 (Mollusca, Gastropoda). J. G. M. Raven 79

Argyrodes Simon, 1864 and *Robertus* O. Pickard-Cambridge, 1879 (Arachnida, Araneae). H. W. Levi 81
Olpium L. Koch, 1873 (Arachnida, Pseudoscorpionida, Olpiidae). M. S. Harvey & V. Mahnert 85
Ichnotropis Peters, 1854 (Reptilia, Sauria). W. R. Branch & D. G. Broadley 89
Erigone Audouin, 1826 (Arthropoda, Araneae). A. F. Millidge 91
Actia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Insecta, Diptera). J. E. O'Hara . . . 93
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology 99
Special Announcements 100
Dapsilarthra Foerster, 1862 (Insecta, Hymenoptera). G. C. D. Griffiths; R. Wharton; C. van Achterberg 101
Adianthus bucatus Ameghino, 1891 (Mammalia). R. L. Cifelli; M. F. Soria 103
Atractocera latipes Meigen, 1804 (Insecta, Diptera, Simuliidae). I. M. Kerzhner; H. Zwick; J. E. Raastad; R. W. Crosskey 109
Proposal to amend Article 70 of the Code. J. R. Vockeroth; K. G. A. Hamilton. 123
Opinion 1298. *Tyrophagus* Oudemans, 1924 (Acarina) 124
Opinion 1299. *Athyreus* Macleay, 1819 and *Glyptus* Brullé, 1835 (Insecta, Coleoptera) 128
Opinion 1300. TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 (Reptilia, Sauria) 130
Opinion 1301. *Artemia* Leach, 1819 (Crustacea, Branchiopoda) . . . 134
Opinion 1302. *Nabis capsiformis* Germar, [1838] (Insecta, Heteroptera, Nabidae) 137
Opinion 1303. *Coccus* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Parthenolecanium* Šulc, 1908 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Homoptera) 139
Opinion 1304. *Melithaea* Milne Edwards & Haime, 1857 and *Isis ochracea* Linnaeus, 1758 (Coelenterata, Anthozoa) 142
Opinion 1305. *Bapta candidaria* Leech, 1897 and *Lamprocabera* Inoue, 1958 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) 144
Opinion 1306. *Ledella bushae* Warén, 1978 and *Ledella* Verrill & Bush, 1897 (Mollusca, Bivalvia) 146
Opinion 1307. *Ptinella* Motschulsky, 1844 and *Nephanes* Thomson, 1859 (Insecta, Coleoptera) 148
Opinion 1308. *Aphis callunae* Theobald, 1915 (Insecta, Hemiptera) . . 150
Opinion 1309. *Geoemyda* Gray, 1834 and *Rhinoclemmys* Fitzinger, 1835 (Reptilia, Testudines) 152
Opinion 1310. *Eutermes exitiosus* Hill, 1925 (Insecta, Isoptera) 154
Opinion 1311. *Corisella* Lundblad, 1928 and *Krizousacorixa* Hungerford, 1930 (Insecta, Heteroptera) 156
Opinion 1312. *Heliothis* Ochsenheimer, 1816 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) . . 158
Opinion 1313. *Testudo scripta* Schoepff, 1792 and *Emys cataspila*, Gunther, 1885 (Reptilia, Testudines) 160
Opinion 1314. *Hydrophorus nebulosus* Fallén, 1823 (Insecta, Diptera) . . 162
Opinion 1315. *Eolis alderi* Cocks, 1852 and *Aeolidiella* Bergh, 1867 (Mollusca, Gastropoda) 165
Opinion 1316. *Globigerina cerroazulensis* Cole, 1928 (Foraminifera) . . 167
Opinion 1317. *Tupus* Sellards, 1906 (Insecta, Protodonata) 169
Opinion 1318. *Lacerta velox* Pallas, 1771 and *Eremias* Wiegmann, 1834 (Reptilia) (correction of ruling given in Opinion 92) 171

Opinion 1319. *Nomioides* Schenck, 1866 (Insecta, Hymenoptera) . . . 173
Opinion 1320. *Hydrodamalis* Retzius, 1794 and *Manatus inunguis* Natterer in Pelzeln, 1883 (Mammalia, Sirenia) 175
Opinion 1321. EPHYDRIDAE Zetterstedt, 1837 and HYDRELLIIDAE Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Insecta, Diptera) 177
Opinion 1322. *Buprestis nana* Paykull, 1799, non Gmelin, 1790 (Insecta, Coleoptera) 180
Opinion 1323. *Byrrhus semistriatus* Fabricius, 1794 (Insecta, Coleoptera) 182
Opinion 1324. *Diademodon* Seeley, 1894 and *Cynochampsa* Owen, 1859 (Reptilia, Therapsida) 185
Opinion 1325. *Capsus ater* Jakovlev, 1889 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Heteroptera) 188
Opinion 1326. *Cimex quadripunctatus* Fabricius, 1794 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Heteroptera) 190
Opinion 1327. *Holocentropus* McLachlan, 1878 (Insecta, Trichoptera) . 192
Direction 118. ARGYNNIDAE, APATURIDAE and LIMENITIDINAE (Insecta, Lepidoptera) (corrections to entries in Official List) 195
Rhabditis Dujardin, [Nov. 1844] (Nematoda). The Secretary. 197
Tornatellina Pfeiffer, 1842 (Mollusca, Gastropoda). The Secretary. . . 199
Southernia Allgen, 1929 and *Southernia* Filipjev, 1927. The Secretary. . 200
Folsomia candida Willem, 1902 (Insecta, Collembola): proposed conservation by suppression of *Entomobrya cavicola* Banks, 1897. P. F. Bellinger 201
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology 205
Special Announcements 206
On proposed amendment to Article 51c of the Code. B. C. Ratcliffe; J. R. Vockeroth; R. W. Crosskey and others 209
Tibicina Amyot, 1847 and *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926. K. G. A. Hamilton; M. Boulard; P. Lauterer 211
Aphelinus mytilaspidis Le Baron, 1870. D. Rosen 214
Chromis Cuvier, 1814 (Osteichthyes). S. O. Kullander; A. R. Emery . . 215
HOLOTHUROIDEA. L. B. Holthuis 219
Glyphipterix Hübner, [1825]. J. D. Bradley & K. Sattler 219
CAECILIIDAE in Amphibia and Insecta. M. H. Wake. 220
Opinion 1328. *Belemnites mucronatus* Schlotheim, 1813 (Coleoidea) . . 222
Opinion 1329. *Galago crassicaudatus* E. Geoffroy, 1812 (Primates, Galigidae) 226
Opinion 1330. *Prodorylaimus* Andrassy, 1959 (Nematoda) 228
Opinion 1331. SPHAERIIDAE Jeffreys, 1862 (1820) (Mollusca, Bivalvia) and MICROSPORIDAE Reichardt, 1976 (Insecta, Coleoptera). . . 230
Opinion 1332. *Calamoecia australica* Sars, 1908 and *Calamoecia australis* (Searle, 1911) (Crustacea, Copepoda) 233
Opinion 1333. *Ipnops murrayi* Günther, 1878 (Ostiechthyes). 236
Opinion 1334. *Harminius* Fairmaire, 1851 (Coleoptera) 238
Opinion 1335. *Nepa cinerea* Linnaeus, 1758 (Insecta, Heteroptera) . . 241
Opinion 1336. Five specific names proposed for *Heterodera* A. Schmidt, 1871 (Aschelminthes, Nematoda) by B. A. Cooper, 1955 . . . 244
Opinion 1337. *Selkirkia columbia* Conway Morris, 1977 as type species of *Selkirkia* Walcott, 1911 (Priapulida) 249
Opinion 1338. *Thrips rufus* Haliday, 1836 (Insecta, Thysanoptera). . . 251
Opinion 1339. *Papilio fatima* Fabricius, 1793 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) . . 255

Opinion 1340. *Attus otiosus* Hentz, 1846 (Arachnida, Araneae) 258
Opinion 1341. *Simulium amazonicum* Goeldi (Insecta, Diptera). . . . 261
Opinion 1342. *Damalis planiceps* Fabricius, 1805 (Insecta, Diptera) . . 264
Opinion 1343. *Kinosternon alamosae* Berry & Legler, 1980 and *Kinosternon oaxacae*, Berry & Iverson, 1980 (Reptilia, Testudines 266
Opinion 1344. *Mayorella* Schaeffer, 1926 given nomenclatural precedence over *Dactylamoeba* Korotneff, 1880 (Rhizopoda, Amoebida) 269
Opinion 1345. *Laomedea flexuosa* Alder, 1857, *Sertularia volubilis* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Campanularia johnstoni* Alder, 1856 (Coelenterata, Hydroida) 271
Opinion 1346. *Cythereis distinguenda* Neviana, 1928, *Cythere crispata* Brady, 1868 and *Cythere pavonia* Brady, 1866 (Crustacea, Ostracoda) 274
Opinion 1347. *Anthalia schoenherri* Zetterstedt, 1838 (Insecta, Diptera) . 277
Opinion 1348. *Bos gaurus* H. Smith, 1827 (Mammalia, Artiodactyla) . . 279
Opinion 1349. *Antilope depressicornis* H. Smith, 1827 and *Anoa quarlesi* Ouwens, 1910 (Mammalia, Artiodactyla) 281
Opinion 1350. *Conus antiquus* Lamarck, 1810 (Mollusca, Gastropoda) . 283
Opinion 1351. *Galeopsomyia* Girault, 1916 (Insecta, Hymenoptera) . . 285
Opinion 1352. *Eurhinus* Schönherr, 1825 (Insecta, Coleoptera): a justified emendation of *Eurhin* Illiger, 1807 287
Opinion 1353. *Myzus festucae* Theobald, 1917 (Insecta, Hemiptera) . . 291
Berytus Fabricius, 1803 (Insecta, Heteroptera, Berytidae). W. R. Dolling 293
Thylacites Germar, 1817; *Brachyderes* Schönherr, 1823; *Cycloderes* Sahlberg, 1823 and *Cycloderes* Schönherr, 1823 Insecta, Coleoptera). A. T. Howden 296
Stenoderma tolteca Saussure, 1860 (Mammalia, Chiroptera). L. de Roguin and C. Weber 302
Neodorippe Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969 (Crustacea, Decapoda). L. B. Holthuis and R. B. Manning 304
Sagartia luciae Verrill, 1898 (Coelenterata, Actiniaria). R. W. Seaton . . 306
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology 311
Special Announcements 312
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature: General Meeting, Budapest, 2–6 September, 1985 313
Financial Report for 1984 323
Comment on proposed amendment of Article 71b of Code. W. D. L. Ride 327
Opinion 1354. *Agrotis redimicula* Morrison, 1874 (Lepidoptera) . . . 330
Opinion 1355. *Lingula anatina* Lamarck, 1801 (Brachiopoda) 332
Opinion 1356. *Dactylopusia* Norman, 1903 (Crustacea, Copepoda) . . 335
Opinion 1357. ANUROPODIDAE Bacescu, 1980 and ANUROPODIDAE Stebbing, 1893 (Crustacea) 338
Opinion 1358. *Calaphis* Walsh, 1862 and *Callaphis* Walker, 1870 (Insecta, Hemiptera) 341
Opinion 1359. UROPLAT- as the stem of family-group names in Reptilia, Sauria and Insecta, Coleoptera 344
Opinion 1360. *Oeciacus vicarius* Horváth, 1912 (Insecta, Hemiptera) . . 347

Opinion 1361. *Larentia capitata* Herrich-Schaeffer, 1839 and *Phalaena posticata* Fabricius, 1794 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) 349
Opinion 1362. *Phalaena coracina* Esper, 1805 and *Phalaena hirtata* Fabricius, 1794 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) 351
Opinion 1363. *Ancistroceroides* Saussure, 1855 (Insecta, Hymenoptera) . 353
Opinion 1364. *Kassina* Girard, 1853 (Amphibia, Anura) 355
Opinion 1365. *Allygus* Fieber, 1872 (Insecta, Homoptera) 357
Opinion 1366. *Mactra sachalinensis* Schrenk, 1862 (Mollusca, Bivalvia) . 359
Opinion 1367. *Alpheus lottini* Guérin, 1829 (Crustacea, Decapoda) . . 361
Opinion 1368. *Pan* and *Panthera* Oken, 1816 (Mammalia, Carnivora) . 365
Semionotus Agassiz, 1832 (Osteichthyes). A. R. McCune 371
Cephalopholis argus Schneider, 1801 and *Cephalopholis sexmaculata* (Rüppell, 1830) (Osteichthyes, Serranidae). J. E. Randall, M. L. Bauchot, A. Ben-Tuvia & P. C. Heemstra 374
Cheirurus Beyrich, 1845 (Trilobita). P. D. Lane 379
Eugynothrips Priesner, 1926 and *Cryptothrips conocephali* Karny, 1913 (Insecta, Thysanoptera). D. J. Brothers & L. A. Mound . . . 382
HETEROGYNIDAE Rambur, 1866 and HETEROGYNIDAE Nagy, 1969 (Insecta). M. C. Day 385
Request for ruling that French theses submitted for *Docteur du Troisième Cycle* are not published. G. C. Hewitt & V. Rousset 387
THAIDIDAE Jousseaume, 1888 (Mollusca, Gastropoda) and THAIDIDAE Lehtinen, 1967 (Arachnida, Araneae). P. T. Lehtinen 389
Drasterius bimaculatus (Rossi, 1790) (Insecta, Coleoptera, Elateridae). M. Mroczkowski 391
Microchrysa Loew, 1855 (Insecta, Diptera). E. P. Nartshuk & R. Rozkošný 393
Musca trilineata Linnaeus, 1767 (Insecta, Diptera). E. P. Nartshuk & R. Rozkošný 395
Family names for the storm petrels and dippers. R. V. Melville 398
Index to Authors 401
List of Decisions in this volume 402
Names placed on Official Lists and Indexes in Decisions published in this volume 406
Index to Key Names. 410
Corrigenda. 420
Particulars of the dates of publication of the several parts in which the present volume was published 420
Instructions to Binder 420

2102

2 April 1985 Volume 42 Part 1
pp. i–ii, 1–98

ISSN 0007–5167

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

The Official Organ of the International
Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

BRITISH MUSEUM
(NATURAL HISTORY)
2[illegible] APR 198[illegible]
PURCHASED
ZOOLOGY LIBRARY

COMMONWEALTH AGRICULTURAL BUREAUX

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

Published by: **Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux**

On behalf of: **International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature**
c/o British Museum (Natural History)
Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

Orders and enquiries concerning subscriptions and back numbers should be sent to:

CENTRAL SALES
COMMONWEALTH AGRICULTURAL BUREAUX
FARNHAM ROYAL
SLOUGH SL2 3BN, U.K.

© *International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature 1985.* All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronically, mechanically, by photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia).*

Vice-President: Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden).*

Secretary: Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD).*

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of election or of most recent re-election)

Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden)* (30 September 1972) *(Vice-President)* **Arthropoda; Ecology**

Prof. Dr. Raphael ALVARADO *(Departamento de Zoologia, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Madrid, Madrid 28040, Spain)* (30 September 1972) **Echinoidea; Asteroidea**

Prof. E. BINDER *(Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, CH 1211 Geneva 6, Switzerland)* (30 September 1972) **Mollusca**

Dr. L.B. HOLTHUIS *(Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Crustacea**

Dr. G. BERNARDI *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Lepidoptera**

Prof. C. DUPUIS *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) **Heteroptera**

Dr. M. MROCZKOWSKI *(Instytut Zoologiczny, Polska Akademia Nauk. ul. Wilcza 64, Warsaw, Poland)* (14 March 1975) **Coleoptera**

Prof. Dr. Otto KRAUS *(Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum, 2000 Hamburg 13, Germany)* (29 September 1976) **Arachnida, Myriapoda**

Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia)* (29 September 1976) *(President):* **Mammalia: Recent and Fossil**

Dr. Curtis W. SABROSKY *(Systematic Entomology Lab., USDA c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (29 September 1976) **Diptera**

Dr. H.G. COGGER *(Australian Museum, Sydney 2000, N.S.W. Australia)* (29 September 1976) **Reptilia: E D P Methods**

Prof. Dr. Gerhard HAHN *(Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universitätsgebiet Lahnberge, 3550 Marburg, BRD)* (27 December 1978) **Palaeontology**

Prof. Dr. O. HALVORSEN *(Institute of Biology and Geology, University of Tromsö, P.O. Box 790, N-9001 Tromsö, Norway)* (27 December 1978) **Parasitology**

Dr. V.A. TRJAPITZIN *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad B-164, USSR)* (27 December 1978) **Entomology**

Dr. F.M. BAYER *(U.S. National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) *(Councillor)* **Octocorallia; Systematics**

Prof. John O. CORLISS *(University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Protozoa; Systematics**

Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD)* (23 August 1979) *(Secretary)* **Palaeontology**
Dr. Y.I. STAROBOGATOV *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad 199164, U.S.S.R.)* (23 August 1979) **Mollusca, Crustacea**
Dr. P.T. LEHTINEN *(Zoological Museum, Department of Biology, University of Turku. SF-20500 Turku 50, Finland)* (8 August 1980) **Arachnida**
Dr. L.R.M. COCKS *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD)* (26 August 1982) **Brachiopoda**
Mr. David HEPPELL, *(Department of Natural History, Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh EH1 1JF, Scotland)* (26 August 1982) *(Councillor)* **Mollusca**
Prof. Jay M. SAVAGE *(Department of Biology, University of Miami, P.O. Box 249118, Coral Gables, Florida 33124, U.S.A.)* (26 August 1982) **Herpetology**
Prof. R. SCHUSTER *(Institut für Zoologie, Universität Graz, Universitätsplatz 2, A–8010 Graz, Austria)* (26 August 1982) **Acari**
Dr. SHUN-ICHI UENO *(Department of Zoology, National Science Museum, Hyakunincho 3-23-1, Shinjukuku, Tokyo 160, Japan)* (26 August 1982) **Entomology**
Prof. A. WILLINK *(Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, Instituto Miguel Lillo, Miguel Lillo 205, 4000 Tucumán, Argentina)* (26 August 1982) **Neotropical Hymenoptera**

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Members of the Trust

Professor H.B. Whittington, F.R.S. *(Chairman)*
Dr. F.G.W. Jones *(Secretary and Managing Director)*
Prof. Per Brinck
Prof. J.H. Callomon
Prof. C.B. Cox
Mr. D. Curry
The Rt. Hon. the Earl of Cranbrook, F.L.S., F.Z.S.
Sir Arthur Drew, K.C.B.
Sir Charles Fleming, K.B.E., F.R.S.
Prof. J. Forest
Col. Francis J. Griffin, O.B.E.
Dr. G.C. Gruchy
Dr. R.H. Hedley, F.I.Biol.
Dr. L.B. Holthuis
Sir Peter Kent, F.R.S.
Prof. Dr. O. Kraus
Dr. M. Luc
Dr. I.W.B. Nye
Dr. E.P.F. Rose, T.D.
Dr. W.D.L. Ride *(ex officio)*
Sir Eric Smith, F.R.S.
Dr. G.B. White
Prof. J.M. Dodd, F.R.S. *(Observer for the Royal Society)*

B. The Officers of the Trust

Mr. R.V. Melville, M.Sc. *(Scientific Controller)*
Mr. M.E. Tollitt, M.Sc., F.L.S., F.R.E.S. *(Assistant Zoologist)*
Mr. J.D.D. Smith *(Administrator)*

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 42, part 1 (pp. i–ii, 1–98) 2 April 1985

NOTICES

(a) *Date of commencement of voting.* In normal circumstances the Commission may start to vote on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* six months after the publication of each application. Any zoologist who wishes to comment on any of the applications in the present part is invited to send his contribution, in duplicate, to the Secretariat of the Commission as quickly as possible, and in any case in time to reach the Secretariat before the close of the six-month period.

(b) *Possible use of the plenary powers.* The possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers is involved in the following applications published in the present part of the *Bulletin* (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23b and 79b):

(1) *Spiroglyphus* Daudin, 1800 and *Stoa* De Serres, 1855 (Mollusca, Gastropoda, VERMETIDAE): proposed suppression of two equivocal generic names. Z.N.(S.) 2340. A. Myra Keen & M. G. Hadfield.

*(2) *Carpophaga aurorae* Peale, 1848 and *Serresius galeatus* Bonaparte, 1855 (Aves): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Columba R. Forsteri* Wagler, 1829. Z.N.(S.) 2277. M. D. Bruce, D. T. Holyoak & J.-C. Thibault.

(3) *Humerobates* Sellnick, 1928 (Arachnida, Acari): misidentification of the type species *Notaspis humeralis* Hermann, 1804. Z.N.(S.) 2374. R. A. Norton

*(4) *Hatschekia* Poche, 1902 (Crustacea, Copepoda): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Pseudoclavella* Bassett-Smith, 1898. Z.N.(S.) 2390. J. B. Jones.

(5) The description of new taxa on enzyme data: a matter for discussion. Z.N.(S.) 2458. J. E. Jelnes; R. Fortuner.

(6) Authorship and dates of the Sowerbys' Mineral Conchology of Great Britain. Z.N.(S.) 2483. C. W. Wright & R. J. Cleevely.

(7) *Hymenolepis* Weinland, 1858 (Cestoda): proposed designation of type species. Z.N.(S.) 1156. The Secretary.

(8) *Echinococcus* Rudolphi, 1801 (Cestoda): proposed confirmation of entry on the Official List. Z.N.(S.) 1157. The Secretary.

(9) *Anoplocephala* Blanchard, 1848 (Cestoda): proposed confirmation of entry on Official List. Z.N.(S.) 2498. The Secretary.
(10) Homonymy in the families HARPIDAE Hawle & Corda, 1847 (Trilobita) and HARPIDAE Bronn, 1849 (Mollusca, Gastropoda). Z.N.(S.) 2331. J. G. M. Raven.
(11) *Argyrodes* Simon, 1864, and *Robertus* O. Pickard-Cambridge, 1879 (Arachnida, Araneae): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Argyrodes* Guénée, 1845 and *Ctenium* Menge, 1871. Z.N.(S.) 1481. H. W. Levi.
(12) *Olpium* L. Koch, 1873 (Arachnida, Pseudoscorpionida, Olpiidae): proposed designation of type species and related problems. Z.N.(S.) 2484. M. S. Harvey & V. Mahnert.
*(13) *Ichnotropis* Peters, 1854 (Reptilia, Sauria): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Thermophilus* Fitzinger, 1843, Z.N.(S.) 2377. W. R. Branch & D. G. Broadley.
(14) *Erigone* Audouin, 1826 (Arthropoda, Araneae): proposed designation of type species. Z.N.(S.) 2480. A. F. Millidge.
(15) *Actia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Insecta, Diptera): proposal to designate type species and neotype. Z.N.(S.) 2491. J. E. O'Hara.

(c) *Receipt of new applications.* The following new applications have been received since the publication of vol. 41(4) on 30 November 1984 (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23b and 79(b):

(1) *Thylacites* Germar, 1817; *Brachyderes* Schönherr, 1823; *Cycloderes* Sahlberg, 1823; and *Cycloderes* Schönherr, 1823 (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposal to maintain current usage. Z.N.(S.) 2490. A. T. Howden.
(2) *Strongylaspis* Spaeth, 1936 (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposal to designate type species. Z.N.(S.) 2492. E. G. Riley.
(3) *Clytia* Lamouroux, 1812 (Coelenterata, Hydroida): proposal to stabilise the nomenclature. Z.N.(S.) 2493. P. F. S. Cornelius & C. Östman.
(4) *Micronecta meridionalis* (Costa, 1860) (Insecta, Heteroptera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2494. A. Jansson.
(5) *Napomyza* Haliday, 1840 (Insecta, Diptera): proposal to validate type species. Z.N.(S.) 2495. G. C. D. Griffiths.
(6) HETEROGYNIDAE Rambur, 1866 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) and HETEROGYNIDAE Nagy, 1969 (Insecta, Hymenoptera): proposal to resolve problem of homonymy of family group names. Z.N.(S.) 2496. M. C. Day.

(7) Proposal that French theses submitted for the degree of Docteur du 3^{e} cycle do not constitute publication. Z.N.(S.) 2497. G. C. Hewitt & V. Rousset.

(8) *Hanzawaia* Asano, 1944 (Foraminifera): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Florilus* de Montfort, 1808 and *Nonionina* d'Orbigny, 1826. Z.N.(S.) 2499. F. T. Banner.

(9) *Sabella* Linnaeus, 1767 and *Bispira* Krøyer, 1856 (Polychaeta): proposed designation of type species. Z.N.(S.) 2500. P. Knight-Jones.

(10) Proposed amendment to 3rd Edition of Code: types of taxa whose names are junior synonyms. Z.N.(S.) 2501. D. Heppell.

(11) *Calcarina* d'Orbigny, 1826 (Foraminifera): proposed conservation by suppression of *Tinoporus* de Montfort, 1808. Z.N.(S.) 2502. F. T. Banner.

(12) *Eugynothrips* Priesner, 1926 (Insecta, Thrysanoptera, Phlaeothripidae): proposed designation of type species. Z.N.(S.) 2503. D. J. Brothers & L. A. Mound.

(13) *Planularia* Defrance, 1826 (Foraminifera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2504. F. T. Banner.

(14) *Cidaris clavigera* König in Mantell, 1822 (Echinoidea, Cidaroidea): proposed designation as type species of *Tylocidaris* Pomel, 1883. Z.N.(S.) 2505. C. W. Wright & A. B. Smith.

*(15) *Apanteles ornigis* Weed, 1887 (Hymenoptera, Braconidae): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2506. J. B. Whitfield.

(16) *Risomurex* Olsson & McGinty, 1958 (Mollusca, Gastropoda): proposed designation of type species. Z.N.(S.) 2507. Th. C. M. Kemperman & H. E. Coomans.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

GUIDELINES FOR APPLICATIONS TO THE COMMISSION

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature is the official publication of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. It is published 4 times a year (in April, June, September and December) by the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux on behalf of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature. Applications to the Commission are published in the Bulletin. Time is then given for comments to be received, published and considered before the Commission votes for or against the proposals in an application. The Commission's final decision is published in the Bulletin in the form of an Opinion.

These guidelines have been prepared for the benefit of zoologists preparing applications to the Commission. They are not intended to be restrictive and cannot cover all situations.

Applications should be prepared in accordance with the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (3rd Edition: published February 1985). Particular attention should be paid to the principles for use of the Commission's plenary powers (Article 79).

Title should indicate the main names concerned. When the application is for the conservation of one name by the suppression of another, the name to be conserved should precede that to be suppressed. The class and order should be given in the title. For example:

> *DELPHINUS TRUNCATUS* MONTAGU, 1821 (MAMMALIA, CETACEA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY SUPPRESSION OF *DELPHINUS NESARNACK* LACÉPÈDE, 1804

Author(s) Name(s) and Address(es) should be listed and the address(es) underlined.

Text should consist of a series of numbered paragraphs setting out the case and leading up to the request to the Commission. The advantages (and any disadvantages) of the request should be spelled out. References in the text should be attributed to individual pages of the publications.

A case to suppress a name on the grounds that it has not been used as a senior synonym of a name in general current usage should be supported by a list of 10 publications by at least 5 different authors over the last 50 years in which the junior synonym has been applied to a particular taxon as its valid name. The individual page references should be given.

The final paragraph of the text should be framed along the following lines, as appropriate:

> 'The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:
> (1) to use the plenary powers to . . . . .
> (2) to place on the Official List. . . . .
> (3) to place on the Official Index. . . . .'

References should start with the author's name in capital letters, followed by the year of publication and the title of the paper in full. In the titles of papers, capital letters should be used only for proper nouns and for all nouns in German. The name of the journal should be given in full and underlined. Series number, volume number, part or fascicule number, pagination and plate and figure numbers should be given in arabic figures. The title of books should be underlined and followed by the number of pages and plates, and the publisher and place of publication. When a reference has been translated or transliterated, the original language should be stated in square brackets at the end. References should be provided for all publications mentioned in the text, including particularly those in which the names included in the formal proposal to the Commission were established. Example of reference:

> WISE, K. A. J. 1957. A new species of *Lithocolletis* (Lepidoptera: Gracillariidae) from New Zealand. *The Proceedings of the Royal Entomological Society of London.* Series B, Vol. 26, parts 1–2, pp. 26–28, pl. 2, fig. 1.

Applicants should consult recently published parts of the Bulletin and construct their applications in accordance with practices used there. The Secretariat can provide specimen copies of applications and is willing to offer advice at an early stage in the preparation of an application.

Applications should be *typed* in *double spacing* and submitted *in duplicate* to:

The Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
c/o British Museum (Natural History)
Cromwell Road
London SW7 5BD, U.K.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
February 1985

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *HYLA LACTEA* DAUDIN, 1803 Z.N.(S.)2341

(see vol. 41, pp. 122–124)

By Andrew F. Stimson (*British Museum (Natural History), London SW7 5BD*)

The object of this petition by Lynch & Duellman to suppress *Hyla lactea* Laurenti appears to be threefold: to conserve *Phyllomedusa hypocondrialis* (Daudin, 1803), to validate *Sphaenorhynchus* Tschudi, 1838 and to conserve *Sphaenorhynchus lacteus* (Daudin, 1803). The first has my full support, the second I consider unnecessary and the third I strongly oppose.

Phyllomedusa hypocondrialis is widely used and the only name currently in use for the species. To replace it with *Hyla lactea* Laurenti, 1768, a name virtually unused in the last 200 years and whose identity is open to doubt, would certainly not be in the best interests of stability. I therefore agree that *H. lactea* Laurenti should be suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority.

Lynch & Duellman state that the currently used generic name *Sphaenorhynchus* Tschudi is invalid because its type species is a junior primary homonym. I can find nothing in the Rules to suggest that homonymy of its type species in any way affects the validity or availability of a nominal genus. Thus no action by the Commission is needed to conserve *Sphaenorhynchus*. Its type species should be cited as *Hyla lactea* Daudin, an invalid senior subjective synonym of *Sphaenorhynchus eurhostus* Rivero.

The third objective of Lynch & Duellman's petition is to conserve the specific name *Hyla lactea* Daudin, 1803, a junior primary homonym of *Hyla lactea* Laurenti, 1768. With this I cannot agree. A search of the literature reveals that there has been little stability of nomenclature as far as this species is concerned. *Hyla aurantiaca* Daudin, 1803, was in general use until 1961 when Rivero (*Bull. Mus. comp. Zool., Harv.* vol. 126, p. 137) indicated that it was a junior primary homonym of *Hyla aurantiaca* Laurenti, 1768. During the next few years *Hyla lactea* Daudin enjoyed a brief resurrection until Rivero (*Copeia*, 1969, p. 701) pointed out that this name too was preoccupied and proposed *Sphaenorhynchus eurhostus* (nom. nov. pro *Hyla aurantiaca* Daudin). In all, I found 25 references to this species published in the last 50 years. Of these, 12 use *aurantiaca* (the latest in 1970) and 3 use *lactea* (between 1961 and 1966). Since 1969 there have been 10 uses of *eurhostus*. To the best of my knowledge this last is the only name currently in use and includes among its users both Lynch and Duellman. My search of the literature may not have been exhaustive but I find it difficult to believe that I have overlooked sufficient references to change the picture significantly. To use the plenary powers to overthrow a currently accepted name in favour of a little used one is surely unthinkable. I therefore totally oppose the proposal to suppress *Hyla lactea* Laurenti for the purposes of the Principle of Homonymy.

Finally, I see that Lynch & Duellman do not cite 10 publications by at least 5 different authors during the last 50 years in which the name *Phyllomedusa hypocondrialis* is used as a senior synonym (Art. 79b). These authors should be asked to supply this information. When this has been done, I suggest the Commission be asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *lactea* Laurenti, 1768, as published in the combination *Hyla lactea*, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) as in Lynch & Duellman.

(3) to place the specific name *eurhostus* Rivero, 1969, as published in the combination *Sphaenorhynchus eurhostus*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

(4) to place the generic name *Sphaenorhynchus* Tschudi, 1838 (gender: masculine, type species by monotypy, *Hyla lactea* Daudin, 1803, a junior primary homonym of *Hyla lactea* Laurenti, 1768, and an invalid senior subjective synonym of *Sphaenorhynchus eurhostus* Rivero, 1969) on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES FOR *NYMPHULA* SCHRANK, 1802. Z.N.(S.)2384

(see vol. 39, pp. 209–212)

By W. Speidel (*Gerwigstrasse 18, D-7500 Karlsruhe 1, West Germany*)

I support the application of Fletcher & Nye, 1982, concerning the species best known as *Nymphula stagnata* (Donovan, 1806).

In 1793 Hübner first published a figure of this species under the name *Phalaena potamogalis*. Unfortunately, this was a misidentification of *Phalaena potamogalis* [Denis & Schiffermüller], 1775, which is an unjustified emendation of *Phalaena (Geometra) potamogata* Linnaeus, 1758, a completely different species now considered to be synonymous with *Phalaena (Geometra) nymphaeata* Linnaeus, 1758.

When Schrank described his genus *Nymphula*, he included a species *potamogalis* in the sense of Hübner, 1793 and 1796 and it was this species that Moore, 1887, cited as the type species of the genus. The valid specific name for this species is *stagnata* Donovan, 1806, and Fletcher & Nye were quite right to ask the Commission to designate that species as the type species of *Nymphula*. This corresponds with Schrank's and Moore's concept of the genus.

Account must, however, be taken of *Phalaena nitidulata* [Hufnagel], 1767 (pp. 618–619) from the vicinity of Berlin, which was placed in the synonymy of *Nymphula nymphaealis* Treitschke, 1829, non [Denis & Schiffermüller], 1775 by Treitschke. This is the same species as *Phalaena stagnata* Donovan. The description by [Hufnagel] strongly supports Treitschke's interpretation: '*Phalaena nitidulata*, Der Wasservogel. Schneeweiss mit einigen irregulären hellbraunen Zeichnungen. Aufenthalt der Phaläne bei Gewässern im Grase. Zeit der Phaläne Julius und August. Grösse der Phaläne von der dritten. Selten.' [Hufnagel] also described *Phalaena nymphaeata* as being 'of the third size', which was his way of giving the relative size of each species. We cannot be completely sure of the identity of [Hufnagel's] species except by reference to Treitschke's interpretation.

In order to avoid any confusion, and to conserve a well-known name, I ask the Commission to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *nitidulata* [Hufnagel], 1767, as published in the binomen *Phalaena nitidulata*, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

[HUFNAGEL], 1767. Fortsetzung der Tabelle von den Nachtvögeln, welche die 3te Art derselben, nehmlich die Spannenmesser (Phalaenas Geometras Linnaei) enthält. *Berlinisches Mag.*, vol. 4 (6), pp. 599–626.

SPEIDEL, W. 1983. The Acentropinae (Lepidoptera Crambidae) from Spain and Portugal. *SHILAP Revta lepid.*, vol. 11, pp. 83–86.

TREITSCHKE, F. 1829. *Die Schmetterlinge von Europa*, vol. 7. Leipzig, 252 pp.

MOORE, F. 1884–1887. *The Lepidoptera of Ceylon*, vol. 3. London, 578 pp., pls 144–215.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *LASPEYRESIA* HÜBNER, [1825]. Z.N.(S.)2421

(see vol. 41, pp. 110–113)

(1) By R. W. Hodges (*Systematic Entomology Lab USDA, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, DC 20560, U.S.A.*)

The following view of Dr Kuznetsov and Dr Kerzhner's case for the suppression of *Cydia* Hübner, [1825] is given for the Commission's consideration before a decision is taken:

1. *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] is a junior homonym of *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817;
2. The oldest synonym of *Laspeyresia* Hübner [1825] is *Cydia* Hübner, [1825];
3. *Cydia* Hübner, [1825] is the valid replacement name for *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825], based on priority. This argument was used and followed by Bradley, 1972 and others as indicated in paragraph 8 of Kuznetsov & Kerzhner's statement;
4. Other arguments have little relevance for the future. Either decision will cause some workers difficulty; however, the decision based on priority, the basic principle of the Code, provides for stability of nomenclature.

The following point, though not germane to my argument, should be significant to the Commission: four checklists (Bradley, 1972 in Kloet & Hincks, *Checklist of British Insects*, pt 2, Lepidoptera; Léraut, 1980, *Liste systématique et synonymique des Lépidoptères de France, Belgique et Corse*; Powell, 1983 in Hodges, *Checklist of Lepidoptera of America north of Mexico*; and Powell, in press, in Heppner, *Atlas of Neotropical Lepidoptera, Checklist, part 1*) that treat a significant part of the world's lepidopteran fauna use *Cydia* Hübner, [1825] as the valid name and cite *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] as a junior homonym of *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817.

I strongly urge the Commission not to suppress *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817.

(2) By William E. Miller (*University of Minnesota, St Paul, Minnesota 55108, U.S.A.*)

As an active tortricidologist, I should like to comment on the proposal by Kuznetsov & Kerzhner to conserve *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] by suppressing *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817 and *Cydia* Hübner, [1825].

The International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, as I understand it, requires that *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] be rejected in favour of *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817 because of priority and homonymy. The proposal argues that applying the Code would cause the loss of the name *Laspeyresia* for a genus of common and important moths. The proposal cites relative counts of usage of the several pertinent names in *Entomology Abstracts* between 1974 and 1978, showing that *Laspeyresia* was the dominant name in that period.

I believe that stable nomenclature is best served when the Code is overriden only for reasons of unusual merit. It seems to me that the issue before the Commission comes down to how compelling the case is for conserving *Laspeyresia*. The argument that current usage of *Laspeyresia* dominates is greatly weakened when the usage figures in the same source are updated to the present. Thus, in *Entomology Abstracts* between January 1979 and July 1984 I count 130 uses of *Cydia* to only 56 of *Laspeyresia*. This shows a reversal of the trend cited in the proposal and shows that usage of *Laspeyresia* is rapidly declining in favour of *Cydia*.

In conclusion, I see little reason why the Commission should exercise its plenary powers as requested by the proposers.

(3) By J. D. Bradley (*formerly of the British Museum (Natural History) and of the Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London*), W. G. Tremewan, K. Tuck (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) and C. J. Hamilton (*Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London*)

With reference to the proposal to suppress *Cydia* Hübner, [1825] in favour of *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825], we offer the following comments for consideration by the Commission:

(1) *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] (TORTRICIDAE) is a junior homonym of *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817 (NOCTUIDAE) as stated by Nye, 1975, *Generic Names of Moths of the World*, vol. 1, p. 269;

(2) The first available replacement name for *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] is *Cydia* Hübner, [1825];

(3) *Cydia* Hübner, [1825], with *Laspeyresia* Hübner, [1825] as a synonym, was used in 1972 in the revised Kloet & Hincks *Checklist of British Insects* part 2, Lepidoptera. The synonymy has since been absorbed without dissent in the world taxonomic and applied (economic) entomological literature. *Cydia* is accepted as the valid name in current western European, North American, Japanese and Indo-Australian faunal lists and other publications, as shown in the attached tabulation based on a computer search at the library of the Commonwealth Institute of Entomology by one of us (C.J.H.);

(4) The use of *Cydia* in place of *Laspeyresia* is now well established and appears to have caused negligible disruption.

We urge the Commission not to suppress *Laspeyresia* R.L., 1817 but to uphold the Principle of Homonymy and thus maintain present stability.

CYDIA versus *LASPEYRESIA*

Bibliometric data obtained by an online search of the agricultural entomology subfile of the CAB Abstracts computer database, covering the world literature abstracted from January 1973 to April 1984 inclusive.

	Soviet (%)	Non-Soviet (%)	Total
Laspeyresia	63 (9·0)	635 (91·0)	698
Cydia	219 (14·0)	1345 (86·0)	1564
Laspeyresia and/or *Cydia*	220 (14·0)	1347 (86·0)	1567
Laspeyresia and *Cydia*	62 (8·9)	633 (91·1)	695
Laspeyresia not *Cydia*	1 (33·3)	2 (67·7)	3
Cydia not *Laspeyresia*	157 (18·1)	712 (81·9)	869

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *ZYGAENA ANTHYLLIDIS* BOISDUVAL, [1828]. Z.N.(S.)2442

(see vol. 41, pp. 73–76)

Support for the proposals put forward by Naumann & Tremewan has been expressed by: Professor E. Aistleitner (*Pädagogische Akademie, Feldkirch, Austria*), Dr B. Alberti (*Mengershausen, Germany*), Dr J. S. Dabrowski (*Cracow*), Dr P. Léraut (*Bonneuil-sur-Marne, France*), J. J. de Freina (*Munich*), Dr M. R. Gómez Bustillo (*SHILAP, Madrid*), A. Hofmann (*Freiburg-im-Breisgau, Germany*), H. Holzinger (*Vienna*), Dr T. Racheli (*Università degli Studi, Rome*), Dr G. Reiss (*Stuttgart*), Dr G. Tarmann (*Tiroler Landskundliches Museum, Innsbruck*), H. de Toulgoët (*Muséum national d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris*), Dr K.-H. Wiegel (Munich), W. Wipking (*University of Cologne*) and T. J. Witt (*Munich*).

Among these, Dr Reiss makes the following points: (1) *Zygaena anthyllidis* Boisduval, [1828] has been the name exclusively used for over 150 years; (2) Boisduval's description and illustrations are exceptionally accurate, as is his mention of the type locality; (3) to introduce *Zygaena erebus* Meigen, 1829 now would cause great confusion, not only because the type locality is not accurately known, but because of other uncertainties surrounding the name.

R. V. MELVILLE

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT CONCERNING INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE, ARTICLE 51c. Z.N.(S.)2474

(see vol. 41, pp. 149–150)

(1) By James C. Cokendolpher (*Department of Entomology, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas 79409, U.S.A.*), Oscar F. Francke (*Department of Biological Sciences, Texas Tech University*), and Diomedes Quintero Jr. (*Museo de Invertebrados, Universidad de Panama, Estafeta Universitaria, Panama*)

We are opposed to the proposed amendment by Gagné *et al.*, 1984, to delete Article 51c from the third edition of the Code. Their arguments that: (a) new combinations are in the majority, (b) the use of parentheses is expensive and time consuming, and (c) parentheses are superfluous and serve a negligible purpose in nomenclature, are at best weak and unsubstantiated and do not justify the deletion.

First, nominal taxa of some groups such as certain families of Diptera might indeed approach having 100% new combinations, but certainly this is not the case in many groups: for example, only 99 of 355 (28%) Scorpiones from the Ethiopian region (Lamoral & Reynders, 1975), 25 of 50 (50%) Palpigradi (Rowland & Sissom, 1980), and 14 of 54 (26%) of the New World Schizomida (Rowland & Reddell, 1978) are recombinations.

Second, typesetting of parentheses is no more expensive than using periods after abbreviations (e.g., II B III, versus I.I.B.I.I.I., or USDA versus U.S.D.A.) or accent marks (e.g., Gagné) because typesetting is charged by the keystroke. The use of italics in scientific names is considerably more expensive than the parentheses in question, and we are glad that Gagné *et al.* are not also proposing elimination of that rule. If The Insect Identification and Beneficial Insect Introduction Institute (= II B III) branch of the SEA, AR, USDA checks all insect names, including spellings of the taxa and the author's names, we cannot imagine how the parentheses would require that much more time or effort. The alleged expense and complications arising during computerised retrieval of names might depend on the program used, but the software packages we are familiar with enable retrieval of an author's name whether it is used with or without parentheses, or both.

Third, for certain groups of organisms such as Palaearctic Diptera and U.S.A. Hymenoptera, recent synoptic and synonymic catalogues exist. Any competent zoologist can look up a specific epithet in those catalogues and easily know its nomenclatural history. Under these circumstances, and provided one has ready access to such catalogues, the information otherwise conveyed by the parentheses around an author's name can be easily retrieved. In other groups, such as the arachnid orders Opiliones, Scorpiones, and Amblypygi in which we specialise, respectively, there are few catalogues and those offer limited geographical coverage. In other groups, and undoubtedly all those other animal taxa which remain uncatalogued, the information conveyed by the parentheses is critical. If the authors of Z.N.(S.)2474 had ever had to search through the Zoological Record, and some earlier catalogues, to retrieve the published literature on a given specific name they would certainly have acquired an appreciation for the 'non-superfluous' nomenclatural information conveyed by the use of parentheses. If there are no parentheses one can initially restrict the search to a more general level of indexing, i.e., generic names; if there are parentheses then one must search at a less general level of indexing, i.e., that of specific names! What if the specific name has been transferred from a masculine combination (e.g., *californicus*) to a feminine one (e.g., *californica*); can one rely on an index to search the literature? Are *Protophthalmus jenseni* Lawrence and *Opistophthalmus jenseni* Lawrence different species of scorpion? If not, under which binominal combination will the original description be found? Of course, the 'negligible' information conveyed by *O. jenseni* (Lawrence) gives us a strong indication about the nomenclatural history of that nominal taxon.

If the information conveyed by parentheses 'is of no interest to the writers or readers' as stated by Gagné *et al.*, why then assume they are interested in the author's name? Many journals devoted to non-taxonomical studies of insects do not require the use of authors' names when listing specific taxa.

Perhaps some non-taxonomical zoologists fail to appreciate the amount of critical nomenclatural information conveyed by the use of parentheses, but that does not mean that parentheses do not serve a useful function. For the reasons given above we oppose the deletion of Article 51c. We also oppose the reduction of this article to a recommendation. If the use or disuse of parentheses is reduced to a recommendation, confusion will result. The deletion of the date from the citation of a specific name does not convey any particular information, but the deletion of parentheses can be misinterpreted to represent a specific name in its original combination.

REFERENCES

LAMORAL, B. & REYNDERS, S. 1975. A Catalogue of the scorpions described from the Ethiopian region. *Ann. Natal Mus.*, vol. 22, pp. 489–576.

ROWLAND, J. M. & REDDELL, J. R. 1979. The Order Schizomida (Arachnida) in the New World. I. Protoschizomida and *dumitrescoae* group (Schizomidae, *Schizomus*). *J. Arachnol.*, vol. 6, pp. 161–196.

ROWLAND, J. M. & SISSOM, W. D. 1980. Report on a fossil Palpigrade from the Tertiary of Arizona, and a review of the morphology and systematics of the order (Arachnida, Palpigradida). *J. Arachnol.*, vol. 8, pp. 69–86.

(2) By Gerhard Hahn (*Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universitäts-Gebiet Lahnberge, D-355 Marburg (Lahn), BRD*

I do not agree with the proposal of Drs Gagné, Thompson and Knutson. Parentheses are a useful indication and I have never found them 'expensive and time consuming', neither in preparing my *Fossilium Catalogus* on Carboniferous and Permian trilobites, nor in preparing my volume on multituberculates. Article 51c should stay unchanged, in my opinion.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 70b

Z.N.(S.)2477

(see vol. 41, pp. 156–158)

By C. W. Wright (*The Old Rectory, Seaborough, near Beaminster, Dorset DT8 3QY U.K.*)

I do not believe that the illegal behaviour by entomologists that Sabrosky seeks to justify by amending the Code does, as he asserts, maintain stability and universality of nomenclature, since any subsequent author may well find reasonable grounds for disagreeing with some of the assumptions behind the behaviour. Moreover the notion of recognition of the species actually involved seems to me of doubtful validity and unlikely to produce stability.

2. If an author Smith establishes a new genus *X-us* with designated type species *A-us b-us* Jones and in the same work describes as *X-us b-us* (Jones) certain specimens now held not to belong to that species, it does not necessarily mean that he has misidentified the type species of *X-us*; he may have misidentified his specimens as *A-us b-us* Jones, quite a different matter, or, commonly, he is less of a splitter than later authors who take the view that his described specimens represent a

new species. He may very well genuinely have wished Jones's *A-us b-us* to be the type species.

3. Sabrosky's proposal recalls the case of *Calycoceras* Hyatt, 1900, dealt with in Opinion 557. Hyatt had designated as type species of his new genus a nominal species that he attributed to an author who had wrongly described specimens as identical with the species described by the original author of the specific name. I had asked the Commission to rule that the nominal species of the original author should be the type. Commissioner Mayr argued that it was important that 'the zoological concept which the author of a new taxon has for its type be regarded by subsequent authors'. He also referred to the 'erroneous belief of many authors that a name is the type of a genus and not a zoological object'. Fortunately the Commission, Mayr and two others dissenting, agreed to the terms of the application. Of course a name as such is not the type of a genus, but no more is a zoological object; the type is a nominal species. Any attempt to replace this notion with that of zoological object or even zoological concept can only, in my view, lead to permanent confusion.

4. Suppose that a subsequent author, faced with the situation in para 2 above, believes that both *A-us b-us* Jones and three other species included by Smith in *X-us* are congeneric but that the specimens described, wrongly, by Smith as *X-us b-us* (Jones) in fact belong to a different genus. Here, if we followed Sabrosky's interpretation of 'the species actually involved' we could well be running counter to 'the zoological concept' of Smith. One can easily imagine several other types of confusion that could arise if the only objective criterion, the species named by the designator, is abandoned.

5. My response to the Secretary's appeal, therefore, is to argue that Article 70b is wrong in principle and dangerous in practice and should be expunged. If, however, a majority of zoologists cannot accept the simple and logical rule that the type of a genus is a nominal species designated by the original or a subsequent author, and still hanker after the idea that it is a specimen or a zoological concept, then Article 70b might be redrafted as follows:

> (b) If a person considers that the author of a genus incorrectly identified specimens with the nominal species that he designated as type species, or that he included, and which was subsequently so designated, and if the genus has subsequently been widely interpreted as if the type were the nominal species to which the misidentified specimens belong, the person is to continue to regard as type species the designated nominal species, but may, if he believes that serious instability of nomenclature would be caused by maintenance of the designated type species, apply to the Commission to, etc.

6. Article 70b has already moved too far from principle. It would be deplorable if improper behaviour such as that quoted in para 3 of Sabrosky's proposal were to be validated. The type of a genus is a nomenclatural concept, not a zoological one. Hence it is right that the 'meaning' of a genus depends on a nomenclatural concept of which the type species is the name-bearer. The 'meaning' of a genus should not be treated as the zoological concept that Sabrosky and Crosskey think that an author had in mind when he designated a (nominal) type species, and also described species that he then held to be congeneric; it is this notion that can lead, at least potentially, to variable results and hence to instability.

7. While the nomenclatural concept is objective, in accordance with the collective provisions of the Code, the zoological concept is subjective and therefore variable and cannot be pinned down by the Code. Only the type concept plus the definition of nominal taxon give hope of stability.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSAL CONCERNING *BAGRUS* BOSC, 1816, WITH REQUESTS TO PLACE *BAGRE* CLOQUET, 1816 ON THE OFFICIAL LIST AND TO SUPPRESS *PORCUS* GEOFFROY SAINT-HILAIRE, 1808

Z.N.(S.)2371

(see vol. 40, pp. 167–172)

By William R. Taylor (*National Museum of Natural History, Washington DC 20560, U.S.A.*)

Bailey & Stewart, 1983, asked that *Bagrus* Bosc, September 1816, be placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology. They presented evidence to show that *Bagrus* and *Porcus* Etienne Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire in Bosc, September 1816 were described on the same date with *Bagrus* having page priority. Because *Bagrus* provides the stem of a well-known family name, and because it has had somewhat more usage, they requested its conservation by the Commission.

2. Aside from dates given by Sherborn, 1897, workers have not generally known the actual dates of publication of the contributions by Etienne and Isidore Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire to the *Description de l'Egypte*. The son, Isidore (1847), listed the significant contributions by his father and himself to this work and gave dates of publication. It is now clear that *Porcus* should be attributed to Etienne Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire and that it has several years' priority over *Bagrus* Bosc. *Porcus* first appeared on plate 15 of the *Poissons du Nil* issued in 1808; but the description of the genus was completed from his father's notes and published by Isidore in 1827. The folio-sized natural history plates in *Description de l'Egypte* were in many cases published years before written descriptions appeared; but the names on the plates are available by indication (Article 12a(7)).

3. Evidence that all the plates of *Poissons du Nil* were published and available to Bosc, Cuvier, etc., prior to 1816 is as follows:

(a) Isidore Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire stated (1847, p. 425): 'La part de collaboration de Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire dans le grand ouvrage sur l'Egypte, se compose des parties suivantes: Dans l'atlas, t. I^{er} de la partie relative à l'histoire naturelle: 1° 7 planches de Mammifères (17 espèces); 2° 8 de Reptiles (25 espèces); 3° 17 de Poissons du Nil (29 espèces); 4° 10 de Poissons de la Méditerranée et de la mer Rouge (28 espèces). Ces magnifiques planches, dessinées par Redouté jeune, . . . en Egypte, . . . à Paris de 1802 à 1807, ont été publiées, partie en 1808 (Poissons du Nil), partie en 1813 (Mammifères et Reptiles), partie en 1817 (Poissons de la mer Rouge et de la Méditerranée).

'Dans le tome I^{er} du texte de l'Histoire naturelle . . . 1° *Histoire naturelle des Poissons du Nil*, 1809 [part]; . . . 2° *Description des Reptiles qui se trouvent en Egypte*, 1809 [part]; . . . 3° *Description des Crocodiles d'Egypte*, 1829. — Le texte des autres planches de Poissons et de Reptiles a été publié, en 1827, par l'auteur de cet ouvrage, d'après les notes de Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire.

'Dans le tome II . . . *Description des Mammifères qui se trouvent en Egypte*, 1813 [part]. . .'

(b) In general agreement with Isidore's summary, Jomard in Monglond, 1957, columns 323–330, indicated that the 27 plates illustrating fishes were published from 1809–1817. I believe, however, that some of the dates for the text given by Jomard are probably in error. These dates were correctly stated by Isidore Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire.

(c) The 17 plates depicting Nile fishes, aside from three illustrating only anatomical details, were all cited by Cuvier, November 1816, in *Le Règne animal*, ed. 1, vol. 2. Plates 18 to 27 illustrating Red Sea and Mediterranean fishes were not cited in that edition because they were not published till 1817. At least six of the plates 18 through 27 were cited in the second edition of *Le Règne animal*, published in 1829.

(d) Thus it appears certain that the 17 plates of fishes of the Nile appeared in 1808 or at the latest 1809, and that plates 18–27 of Mediterranean and Red Sea fishes were published in 1817.

4. Two species of *Porcus* were illustrated by H. J. Redouté for Etienne in plate 15: Le Bayad fitilé, *Porcus bayad*, and Le Bayad docmac, *Porcus docmac*. The type species of *Porcus* Etienne Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire is *Silurus bajad* Forskål, 1775 (= *Porcus bayad* Etienne Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire; it is clear from Isidore's text, *Hist. nat.*, vol. 1, p. 303, that Etienne's *bayad* is an unjustified emendation of Forskål's *bajad*), by subsequent designation by Jordan & Evermann, 1917, *Genera of Fishes*, vol. 1, p. 107. Jordan & Evermann incorrectly said that the description and/or plates were published ('dated') in 1817 or 1818.

5. *Bagrus* Bosc, 1816. with type species *Silurus bajad* Forskål by subsequent designation by Bailey & Stewart, 1983, *op. cit.*, is a junior objective synonym of *Porcus* Etienne Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1808.

6. *Bagre* Cloquet, 1816. *Bagre* is to be treated as masculine because it is latinised from the Spanish and Portuguese masculine noun bagre, denoting catfish throughout much of tropical America. Its origin is probably from the Arabic bäghir or baghãr. The type species is *Silurus bagre* Linnaeus, 1766, by absolute tautonymy, through listing in the synonymy of *Bagre pimelodinus* Cloquet. The descriptions, in part, of *B. pimelodinus*, and of the other included synonym, *Pimelodus bagre* Lacépède, apply not to *Silurus bagre* Linnaeus but to *Silurus marinus* Mitchill. I suspect that Mitchill's species belongs to another genus and that *Bagre bagre* (Linnaeus) is the only taxonomic species in the genus *Bagre*.

7. I support the proposal to place BAGRIDAE Bleeker, 1858 on the Official List. Bleeker, 1858, pp. V, 49, etc., first used a subfamily 'Bagrichthyoidei' and 'cohors Bagrini' to include *Bagrus* and other siluroid fishes. It happens that Bleeker had previously described a bagrid fish as *Bagrichthys*, leading to the false impression that that name provides the stem of Bagrichthyoidei. I believe that *Bagrus* provides this stem, by analogy with Bleeker's 'subfamily Plotosichthyoidei and 'phalanx Plotosini', both based on the generic name *Plotosus*.

8. Because of the long uncertainty as to the dates of publication of *Porcus* and *Bagrus*, because the latter name has in recent years become widely accepted as the generic name for a group of African bagrid fishes, and because it provides the stem of its family name, I ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(a) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Porcus* Etienne Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1808, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority, but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

(b) to place on the Official List of Generic names in Zoology:
  (i) *Bagre* Cloquet, 1816 (gender: masculine), type species, by absolute tautonymy, *Silurus bagre* Linnaeus, 1766;
  (ii) *Bagrus* Bosc, 1816 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Bailey & Stewart, 1983, *Silurus bajad* Forskål, 1775;

(c) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
  (i) *bagre* Linnaeus, 1766, as published in the binomen *Silurus bagre* (specific name of type species of *Bagre* Cloquet, 1816);
  (ii) *bajad* Forskål, 1775, as published in the binomen *Silurus bajad* (specific name of type species of *Bagrus* Bosc, 1816);

(d) to place BAGRIDAE Bleeker, 1858 (type genus, *Bagrus* Bosc, 1816) on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

GEOFFROY SAINT-HILAIRE, ISIDORE. 1847. *Vie, travaux, et doctrine scientifique d'Etienne Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire par son fils*. Paris, 479 pp.

LINNAEUS, C. 1766. *Systema Naturae*, ed. 12, vol. 1.

MONGLOND, A. 1957. La France révolutionnaire et impériale. *Annales de bibliographie méthodique et description des livres illustrés*, vol. 8 (années 1809–1810). Paris. (JOMARD, E. F., columns 268–343.)

OPINION 1288
SPHINX TIPULIFORMIS CLERCK, 1759 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *salmachus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Sphinx salmachus*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *tipuliformis* Clerck, 1759, as published in the binomen *Sphinx tipuliformis*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2916.

(3) The specific name *salmachus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Sphinx salmachus*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1137.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2138

An application for the conservation of *Sphinx tipuliformis* Clerck, 1759, was first received from Dr N. P. Kristensen (*Universitets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*) on 1 August 1975. It was sent to the printer on 15 April 1980 and published on 25 September 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 154–156. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and eight entomological journals. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)13 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 155. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Savage, Cocks, Willink, Schuster, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Binder, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Lehtinen

Negative Vote — Hahn.

Dupuis abstained. No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

Hahn commented: 'Important details are missing here: are *salmachus* and *tipuliformis* objective or subjective synonyms, are their types preserved and, following this, should the relative precedence procedure not have been better used? These things are not clear and so I vote against.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

salmachus, *Sphinx*, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 493

tipuliformis, *Sphinx*, Clerck, 1759, *Icones Insectorum rariorum...e C. Linn. Syst. Nat. allegatis*, pt. 1, pl. 9, fig. 1.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)13 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1288.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
11 July 1984

OPINION 1289
MESOPLODON GERVAIS, 1850 (MAMMALIA, CETACEA); CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the generic name *Nodus* Wagler, 1830, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The generic name *Mesoplodon* Gervais, 1850 (gender: masculine), type species, by original designation, *Delphinus sowerbiensis* Blainville, 1817, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2228.

(3) The specific name *bidens* Sowerby, 1804, as published in the binomen *Physeter bidens* (the valid name, at the time of this ruling, of the type species of *Mesoplodon* Gervais, 1850) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2917.

(4) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Nodus* Wagler, 1830, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above (Name Number 2144);
(b) *Micropteron* Eschricht, 1849, an incorrect subsequent spelling of *Micropterus* Wagner, 1846 (Name Number 2145);
(c) *Mikropteron* Eschricht, 1849, an incorrect subsequent spelling of *Micropterus* Wagner, 1846 (Name Number 2146).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2081

An application for the conservation of *Mesoplodon* Gervais, 1850 was first received from Dale W. Rice (*U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Seattle, Washington, U.S.A.*) in 1965. A second application in the same sense was received from Dr Kenneth E. Kinman (*University of Kansas*) in November 1977. A joint application by both authors was eventually sent to the printer on 9 October 1979 and published on 25 April 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 30–33. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and two mammalogical serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)14 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 32–33. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-three (23) received in the following order: Melville, Savage, Cocks, Willink, Schuster, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Binder, Hahn, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Lehtinen, Dupuis

Negative Votes — none (0).

No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

bidens, Physeter, Sowerby, 1804, *Trans. linn. Soc. London,* vol. 7, p. 10
Mesoplodon Gervais, 1850, *Ann. Sci. nat.* (3), Zool., vol. 14, p. 16
Micropteron Eschricht, 1849, *K. dansk. Vidensk. Selsk. Skr.* (5), vol. 1, p. 97
Mikropteron Eschricht, 1849, *K. dansk. Vidensk. Selsk. Skr.* (5), vol. 1, p. 98
Nodus Wagler, 1830, *Nat. Syst. Amphibien,* p. 34.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)14 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1289.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
11 July 1984

OPINION 1290
LEPTINOTARSA CHEVROLAT, 1837 (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA); CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) the generic name *Polygramma* Chevrolat, 1837, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

(b) all designations of type species for the nominal genus *Leptinotarsa* Chevrolat, 1837, prior to the designation by Motschulsky, 1860, of *Leptinotarsa heydenii* Stål, 1858 as type species of that genus are hereby set aside.

(2) The generic name *Leptinotarsa* Chevrolat, 1837 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Motschulsky, 1860, as ratified under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, *Leptinotarsa heydenii* Stål, 1858, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2229.

(3) The specific name *heydenii* Stål, 1858, as published in the binomen *Leptinotarsa heydenii* (specific name of type species of *Leptinotarsa* Chevrolat, 1837) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2918.

(4) The generic name *Polygramma* Chevrolat, 1837, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2147.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2048

An application for the conservation of *Leptinotarsa* Chevrolat, 1837 was first received from Dr Richard E. White (*Systematic Entomology Laboratory USDA, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington D.C.*) and Dr Richard L. Jacques, Jr. (*Fairleigh Dickinson University, Rutherford, New Jersey*) on 7 June 1973. It was sent to the printer on 24 October 1973 and published on 20 September 1974 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 31, pp. 144–145. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and seven entomological serials. No comment was received.

FIRST VOTE OF THE COMMISSION

On 7 April 1978 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1978)4 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 31, p. 145. Although at the close of the voting period on 7 July 1978 there were 21 affirmative votes and no negative votes, no Opinion was published because of a point raised by Dr L. B. Holthuis. He pointed out that the acceptance by the applicants of Chevrolat's citation of '*juncta* Germar' under *Polygramma* as an available name logically entailed also the acceptance of the citations of '*alternata* Klug' under *Polygramma* and of '*cinctipennis* Chev.' under *Leptinotarsa* as available names also. *Chrysomela juncta* Germar, 1834, is a chrysomelid of the same subfamily as *Polygramma; 'alternata* Klug' must be taken to be *Agra alternata* Klug, 1834, *Jahrb. Insektenk.* vol. 1, p. 60, a ground beetle; and '*cinctipennis* Chev.' as *Altica cinctipennis* Chevrolat, 1834, *Coleopt. Mex.* (3), no. 86, a species placed in a different subfamily from *Leptinotarsa.* In spite of the unlikelihood of coleopterists of the quality of Dejean and Chevrolat making such taxonomic allocations, the acceptance of those logical conclusions radically alters the presentation of the case. V.P.(78)4 was accordingly cancelled.

REPUBLICATION OF THE CASE

Dr White accordingly prepared a fresh application which was received on 28 November 1979. A slightly revised form of this was sent to the printer on 23 January 1980 and published on 19 June 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 119–120. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was again given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and seven entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)15 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 120. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-three, received in the following order: Melville, Savage, Cocks, Willink, Schuster, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Binder, Hahn, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Lehtinen, Dupuis

Negative Votes — none (0).

No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

Dupuis commented: 'Je pense, néanmoins, qu'il aurait fallu simultanément prendre des dispositions pour conserver *Leptinotarsa decemlineata* [the scientific name of the Colorado Potato Beetle] au cas où l'on découvrirait que *decemlineata* et *heydenii* ne peuvent demeurer congénères.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

heydenii, Leptinotarsa, Stål, 1858, *Ofvers. k. Vetenskaps Akad. Förh.* vol. 15, p. 475
Leptinotarsa Chevrolat, 1837, in Dejean, *Cat. Coleopt.* vol. 5, p. 397
Polygramma Chevrolat, 1837, in Dejean, *Cat. Coleopt.* vol. 5, p. 397.

The following is the original reference to a type-species designation ratified by the ruling given in the present Opinion: of *Leptinotarsa heydenii* Stål, 1858, as type species of *Leptinotarsa* Chevrolat, 1837, by Motschulsky, 1860, in Schrenk, *Reisen Forsch. Amurlände*, vol. 2(2), p. 182.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)15 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly accepted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion 1290.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
12 July 1984

OPINION 1291
ANTILOPE ZEBRA GRAY, 1838 (MAMMALIA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) the specific name *zebrata* Robert, 1836, as published in the binomen *Antilope zebrata*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

(b) it is hereby ruled that the specific name *zebra* Gray, 1838, as published in the binomen *Antilope zebra*, is to be given precedence over the specific name *doria* Ogilby, 1837, as published in the binomen *Antilope doria*, whenever the two names are considered synonyms.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *zebra* Gray, 1838, as published in the binomen *Antilope zebra*, with an endorsement that it is to be given precedence over the specific name *doria* Ogilby, 1837, as published in the binomen *Antilope doria*, whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2919);

(b) *doria* Ogilby, 1837, as published in the binomen *Antilope doria*, with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *zebra* Gray, 1838, as published in the binomen *Antilope zebra*, whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2920).

(3) The specific name *zebrata* Robert, 1836, as published in the binomen *Antilope zebrata*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1138.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1908

An application for the conservation of the name *Antilope zebra* Gray, 1838 as the name of the zebra duiker was first received from Mr W. F. H. Ansell (then of *Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and National Parks, Zambia*) on 10 November 1969. It was sent to the printer on 10 March 1970 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 27, p. 104 on 10 August 1970. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials and to two mammalogical serials. A critical comment by Dr Hans-Jürg Kuhn (*Anatomisches Institut, Frankfurt, Germany*) was published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 28, pp. 14–15 on 10 August 1971. Mr Ansell's reply was published in vol. 30, p. 136 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* on 6 July 1973.

In the light of these exchanges it was decided to put forward a fresh application, and this was published on 25 September 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 152–153 (the delay at this stage was largely due to the difficulty of procuring a copy of the original reference to *Antilope zebrata* Robert). Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and two mammalogical serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on voting Paper (1984)16 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 153. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Savage, Cocks, Willink, Schuster, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Binder, Hahn, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Uéno, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Lehtinen

Negative Votes — two (2): Holthuis, Cogger.

Dupuis returned an invalid vote against proposals other than those presented for a vote. No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'The difference between *zebra* and *zebrata* is so minor that it seems to me not worth while to use the plenary powers to get rid of the latter. Strict adherence to the Code solves the problem most easily and elegantly; moreover, *A. doria* then offers no problem.'

Cogger: 'If *Antilope doria* is indeed a junior objective synomym of *A. mhorr*, as the applicant contends, then the application is redundant. If the converse, then taxonomic resolution should precede the nomenclatural.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

doria, Antilope, Ogilby, 1837, *Proc. zool. Soc. London*, vol. 4, no. 47, p. 121
zebra, Antilope, Gray, 1838, *Ann. nat. Hist.* vol. 1 (1), p. 27
zebrata, Antilope, Robert, 1836, *Echo du Monde savant*, 1 May 1836, *Sci. nat. géogr.*, first page.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)16 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1291.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
26 July 1984

OPINION 1292

VOLUTA PAPILIO LINK, 1807 (GASTROPODA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the specific name *papilio* Link, 1807, as published in the binomen *Voluta papilio*, is to be given precedence over the specific name *leucostoma* Gmelin, 1791, as published in the binomen *Voluta leucostoma*, whenever the two Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *papilio* Link, 1807, as published in the binomen *Voluta papilio*, with an endorsement that it is to be given precedence over *leucostoma* Gmelin, 1791, as published in the binomen *Voluta leucostoma*, whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2921);

(b) *leucostoma* Gmelin, 1791, as published in the binomen *Voluta leucostoma*, with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *Voluta papilio* Link, 1807, whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2922).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1777

An application for the suppression of three unused specific names of species of *Voluta* was first received from Dr W. O. Cernohorsky (*Auckland Institute and Museum, New Zealand*) on 29 September 1966. It was sent to the printer on 8 November 1966 and published on 6 March 1967 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 24, pp. 53–54. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin*, to the statutory serials and to two malacological serials. Owing to the then unsatisfactory state of affairs surrounding Article 23b, the case was set aside.

A revised application was received on 24 November 1978. This showed that two of the three names originally involved could be dealt with automatically; only *Voluta leucostoma* Gmelin, 1791 was still a threat to the stability of nomenclature. After an exchange of correspondence this application was sent to the printer on 15 April 1980 and published on 25 September 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 149–151. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and two malacological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)7 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 176. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Savage, Cocks, Willink, Schuster, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Binder, Hahn, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Lehtinen, Dupuis

Negative Votes — two (2) Ride, Heppell.

No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Ride: 'No case is made for the need to preserve *V. leucostoma* Gmelin, 1791; it is a forgotten name and the applicant has "no doubt" that it is a synonym of *V. papilio* Link, 1807. The Commission should be asked to suppress *V. leucostoma* under Article 79b. Unless there is good reason for it, applicants should not seek to preserve forgotten senior synonyms under the relative precedence procedure. Such action is liable to confuse the nomenclature of the group.'

Heppell: 'If there was a good case for the suppression of *V. leucostoma* thirteen years ago, there is an even better one now, as it has remained unused and doubtless will so continue. Why, therefore, does Cernohorsky ask for a relative-precedence decision?'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

leucostoma, Voluta, Gmelin, 1791, *Syst. Nat.*, ed. 13, vol. 1, p. 3457
papilio, Voluta, Link, 1807, *Beschr. nat. Samml. Univ. Rostock* (3), p. 127.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)17 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1292.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
27 July 1984

OPINION 1293

SCOLIA QUINQUECINCTA FABRICIUS, 1793 IS THE TYPE SPECIES OF *HETERELIS* COSTA, 1887 (INSECTA, HYMENOPTERA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Heterelis* Costa, 1887 are hereby set aside and the nominal species *Scolia quinquecincta* Fabricius, 1793, is hereby designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The generic name *Heterelis* Costa, 1887 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Scolia quinquecincta* Fabricius, 1793, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2230.

(3) The specific name *quinquecincta* Fabricius, 1793, as published in the binomen *Scolia quinquecincta* (specific name of type species of *Heterelis* Costa, 1887) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2923.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1175

The earlier history of this case was reviewed in a report by the Secretary to the Commission published on 19 June 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 117–118. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and seven entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)18, for or against the proposals set forth in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 118. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-three (23) received in the following order: Melville, Savage, Cocks, Willink, Schuster, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Binder, Hahn, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Lehtinen, Dupuis

Negative Votes — none (0)

No votes were returned by Bernardi and Dupuis.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Heterelis A. Costa, 1887, *Prospetto degli imenotteri italiani* (2), p. 104
quinquecincta, Scolia, Fabricius, 1793, *Entomol. Syst.*, vol. 2, p. 234.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)18 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion Number 1293.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
27 July 1984

OPINION 1294

EDWARDSIA DE QUATREFAGES, 1841 (COELENTERATA, ACTINIARIA): CONSERVED

RULING.— (1) Under the plenary powers, the generic name *Edwardsia* da Costa, 1834, and all uses of that name prior to its publication by de Quatrefages in 1841, are hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The generic name *Edwardsia* de Quatrefages, 1841 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Carlgren, 1949, *Edwardsia beautempsii* de Quatrefages, 1842) is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2231.

(3) The specific name *beautempsii* de Quatrefages, 1842, as published in the binomen *Edwardsia beautempsii* (specific name of type species of *Edwardsia* de Quatrefages, 1841) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2924.

(4) The family-group name EDWARDSIIDAE Andres, 1881 (type genus *Edwardsia* de Quatrefages, 1841) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 563.

(5) The generic name *Edwardsia* de Costa, 1834, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2149.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2261

An application for the conservation of the generic name *Edwardsia* de Quatrefages, 1841 was first received from Dr R. B. Williams (*Tring, Herts, U.K.*) on 14 April 1978. It was sent to the printer on 17 May 1979 and published on 25 October 1979 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 175–179. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and two in the field of marine biology.

Mr R. K. Brooke (*University of Cape Town*) and Professor J. H. Day (*Rosebank, South Africa*) observed that there was no need to conserve the family-group name EDWARDSIIDAE Andres, 1881; Dr Williams replied that this proposal was an integral part of the case to be considered by the Commission (see *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 135–136). No other comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 6 July 1983 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1983)7 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 176. At the close of the voting period on 6 October 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Willink, Mroczkowski*, Hahn, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Schuster*, Bayer, Uéno*, Sabrosky, Binder, Ride*, Dupuis, Halvorsen, Brinck, Corliss, Alvarado, Heppell* (those marked thus * voted against placing EDWARDSIIDAE Andres, 1881 on the Official List)

Negative Votes — none (0).

A late affirmative vote was returned by Cocks. Welch was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Kraus, Lehtinen and Savage.

One of the problems mentioned (but not fully addressed) in the application concerned the status of *Milnea* Reichenbach as cited by Wright, 1866, *Rec. zool. Lit.* vol. 2, p. 782. That name is clearly a nomen nudum as of that citation, but it was proposed as a replacement name for *Edwardsia* de Quatrefages, 1841, and, if available, would clearly validly replace that name and preoccupy *Milnea* Lydekker, 1891 (Aves). Ride commented on this name in his voting paper as follows: 'While the protection of *Edwardsia* is not needed against *Milnea* Reich. (the latter is a junior objective synonym of the former once the homonymy has disappeared), a palaeo-ornithologist should be asked to consider its effect on *Milnea* Lydekker, 1891. However, this issue raises the possibility that there may be a family-group name prior to EDWARDSIIDAE Andres, 1881 based on *Milnea* Reichenbach or on some other, undetected, replacement name for *Edwardsia* de Q.' Dr Williams was asked if he knew of any such names but knew of none and found none. Further, Dr C. A. Walker (*British Musuem, Natural History*) could find no trace of '*Milnea* Reichenbach, 1866' in the palaeo-ornithological literature; a search of the botanical literature (since Reichenbach was a botanist) was equally fruitless, but revealed that, if the name existed in botany, it would be invalid as a junior homonym of *Milnea* Roxburgh, 1824 and *Milnea* Rafinesque, 1838.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

beautempsii, Edwardsia, de Quatrefages, 1842, *Ann. Sci. nat.* (Zool.), (2) vol. 18, p. 69
Edwardsia da Costa, 1834, *Cenni zoologici* (Naples), p. 62
Edwardsia de Quatrefages, 1841, l'*Institut* vol. 9, p. 427
EDWARDSIIDAE Andres, 1881, *Mitt. zool. Stat. Neapel,* vol. 2, p. 333.

The following is the original reference for a type-species designation ratified by the ruling given in the present Opinion: of *Edwardsia beautempsii* de Quatrefages, 1842 as type species of *Edwardsia* de Quatrefages, 1841, by Carlgren, 1949, *K. Vetenskaps Akad. Handl.* (4) vol. 1, p. 23.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(83)7 were cast as set out above, that the proposal for the use of the plenary powers contained therein has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion Number 1294.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
14 August 1984

OPINION 1295

ACTINIA LINNAEUS, 1767 AND ACTINIIDAE RAFINESQUE, 1815 (COELENTERATA, ACTINIARIA) AND *PENTACTA* GOLDFUSS, 1820 (ECHINODERMATA, HOLOTHURIOIDEA): CONSERVED

RULING.— (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) the generic name *Priapus* Linnaeus, 1758 is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

(b) the generic name *Actinia* Pallas, 1766 is hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy;

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Actinia* Linnaeus, 1767 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Thompson, 1858, *Priapus equinus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Name Number 2232);

(b) *Pentacta* Goldfuss, 1820 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Actinia doliolum* Pallas, 1766 (Name Number 2233).

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *equinus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Priapus equinus* (specific name of type species of *Actinia* Linnaeus, 1767) (Name Number 2925);

(b) *doliolum* Pallas, 1766, as published in the binomen *Actinia doliolum* (specific name of type species of *Pentacta* Goldfuss, 1820) (Name Number 2926).

(4) The family-group name ACTINIIDAE Rafinesque, 1815 (type genus *Actinia* Linnaeus, 1767) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 564.

(5) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Priapus* Linnaeus, 1758, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above (Name Number 2150);

(b) *Actinia* Pallas, 1766, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above (Name Number 2151).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)825

The urgency of the need to conserve the generic name *Actinia* Linnaeus, 1767 was first mentioned to the Commission's Secretariat by the late Professor F. Pax in 1954. No application was, however, submitted at that time. In 1979 Dr P. L. F. Cornelius (*British Museum, Natural History*), on behalf of himself and of Dr Ray Williams (*Tring*) and Miss Ailsa Clark (*British Museum, Natural History*) announced that they were preparing a joint application on this subject. This was received on 3 April 1981, was sent to the printers on 25 August 1982 and published on 7 December 1982 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 288–292. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general periodicals and two marine biological periodicals. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)20 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 290–291. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss, Heppell

Negative Votes — none (0).

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No voting papers were returned by Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Willink.

The applicants had originally attributed the family-group name ACTINIIDAE to Goldfuss, 1820, *Handb. Zool.* vol. 1, p. 166. Dr Holthuis observed on his voting paper that the name should be attributed instead to Rafinesque, 1815, *Analyse de la Nature*, p. 155. This was accepted by Dr Cornelius and is incorporated in the present ruling.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Actinia Pallas, 1766, *P.S. Pallas Misc. zool.*, p. 152
Actinia Linnaeus, 1767, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 12, vol. 1, p. 1088
ACTINIIDAE Rafinesque, 1815, *Analyse de la Nature*, p. 155
doliolum, Actinia, Pallas, 1766, *P. S. Pallas Misc. zool.*, p. 152
equinus, Priapus, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 656
Pentacta Goldfuss, 1820, *Handb. Zool.* vol. 1, p. 177
Priapus Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 656.

The following is the original reference to a type-species designation accepted in the ruling given in the present Opinion: of *Priapus equinus* Linnaeus, 1758 as type species of *Actinia* Linnaeus, 1767, by Thompson, W., 1858, *Proc. zool. Soc. London*, p. 146.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)20 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1295.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
2 October 1984

OPINION 1296
REQUEST FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO CONSERVE *NETTASTOMELLA* CARPENTER, 1865 (BIVALVIA) REFUSED

RULING.— (1) The request for the use of the plenary powers to conserve *Nettastomella* Carpenter, 1865, through the suppression of *Netastoma* Carpenter, 1864, is hereby refused.

(2) The generic name *Netastoma* Carpenter, 1864 (gender: neuter), type species, by monotypy, *Pholas darwinii* G. B. Sowerby II, 1849, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2234.

(3) The specific name *darwinii* G. B. Sowerby II, 1849, as published in the binomen *Pholas darwinii* (specific name of type species of *Netastoma* Carpenter, 1864) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2927.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1054

An application for the conservation of *Nettastomella* Carpenter, 1865 through the suppression of its senior objective synonym *Netastoma* Carpenter, 1864 was first received from Mr Joshua L. Baily (*San Diego, California*) on 12 December 1955. For reasons that cannot now be determined it was never published. A fresh application in the same sense was received from Dr Eugene V. Coan and Dr George L. Kennedy on 19 September 1976. After considerable correspondence, this was sent to the printer on 23 January 1980 and published on 19 June 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 114–116. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general periodicals and three malacological periodicals.

The application was supported by Professor Ruth D. Turner (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Massachusetts*) but opposed by Dr Lee A. Schremp and Dr Jack D. Mount (*University of California, Riverside*), who asked that *Netastoma* Carpenter, 1864 and *Pholas darwinii* G. B. Sowerby II, 1849 be placed on the Official List. This comment was published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, p. 9 on 26 February 1981.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)21 either for the original proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 115 (Alternative A) or for the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, p. 9 (Alternative B).

At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

For Alternative A — seven (7) received in the following order: Schuster, Binder, Starobogatov, Uéno, Hahn, Brinck, Corliss

For Alternative B — eight (8) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Savage, Heppell, Sabrosky, Kraus.

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Willink.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

darwinii, Pholas, G. B. Sowerby II, 1849, *Thesaurus conchylium,* vol. 2 (10), p. 490, pl. 107, figs. 76–77

Netastoma Carpenter, 1864, *Rep. brit. Assoc. Adv. Sci.* for 1863, pp. 529, 540, 605, 635, 637, 684.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)21 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1296.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
3 October 1984

OPINION 1297
XENOCREPIS PURA MAYR, 1904 DESIGNATED AS TYPE SPECIES OF *XENOCREPIS* FOERSTER, 1856 (INSECTA, HYMENOPTERA)

RULING.— (1) Under the plenary powers, all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Xenocrepis* Foerster, 1856 are hereby set aside and *Xenocrepis pura* Mayr, 1904 is hereby designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The generic name *Xenocrepis* Foerster, 1856 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Xenocrepis pura* Mayr, 1904, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2235.

(3) The specific name *morys* Walker, 1848 as published in the binomen *Pteromalus morys* (the valid name at the time of this ruling for the type species of *Xenocrepis* Foerster, 1856) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2928.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1437

The application for the use of the plenary powers to vary the type species of *Xenocrepis* Foerster, 1856 was made in a report by the Secretary sent to the printer on 14 October 1980 and published on 26 February 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 74–75. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* and was sent to the statutory serials, to seven general periodicals and eight entomological periodicals. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)22 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, p. 75. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Heppell (in part), Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Vote — Heppell (in part).

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No voting papers were returned by Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Willink.

Heppell voted for the use of the plenary powers but against placing any names on the Official List. He observed: 'It is obviously important for the Commission to clarify whether *Caenocrepis arenicola* or *Xenocrepis* *pura* is the type species of *Xenocrepis* Foerster. It would seem to be doubtful whether or not *Xenocrepis* sensu Ashmead represents the same taxon as *Xenocrepis* Foerster, and therefore I have no hesitation in voting for the fixation of *X. pura* as the type by the use of the plenary powers. The remainder of the proposals, however, seem to bring in complicated taxonomic considerations of whether *Xenocrepis* is a junior synonym of *Mesopolobus* and *X. pura* a junior synonym of *Pteromalus morys*. I can see no justification for putting the latter on the Official List of Specific Names and little for putting *Xenocrepis* on the Official List of Generic Names. Whatever the Commission may believe is the status of names on the Official Lists, entomologists are certain to conclude that these names would not have been placed there unless they were intended to be used as the valid names of the taxa in question. Consequently, I vote for the principal proposition but against the subsidiary proposals.'

In reply to a request from the Secretary, Dr. Z. Bouček (of the *Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London*) provided the following reply: 'It would be satisfactory if the type species of *Xenocrepis* were fixed as the *X. pura* Mayr, but it is immaterial whether either name is placed on the Official Lists, whatever their status may be. The main thing is to avoid destabilization of names, if *Xenocrepis* is regarded as a valid genus instead of as a part of the large genus *Mesopolobus*. If Ashmead's action was accepted as correct, *Caenocrepis* Thomson could not be used as a valid name, and that genus, as understood, contains at least one species of economic importance used in the USSR in biological control against a weevil pest of sugarbeet. That would change the name of that genus; hence it is a relatively important matter to have the type species fixed as proposed.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:
morys, Pteromalus Walker, 1848, *List Hym. Coll. Brit. Mus.* (2), p. 197
Xenocrepis Foerster, 1856, *Hym. Stud. Aachen* (2), p. 64.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)22 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1297.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
3 October 1984

DIRECTION 116
PAPILIONIDAE LATREILLE, [1802] (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): REVISION OF OFFICIAL LIST ENTRY

RULING.— (1) Entry No. 233 in the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology is hereby deleted and replaced by the following: PAPILIONIDAE Latreille, [1802] (as 'Papilionides'), *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.* vol. 3, p. 387, type genus *Papilio* Linnaeus, 1758 (Name Number 233).

(2) The family-group name Papilionides Latreille, [1802] (same reference as in (1) above), an incorrect original spelling of PAPILIONIDAE, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 500.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2245

An application for the correction of the Official List entry for the family-group name PAPILIONIDAE was first received from Lt-Col C. F. Cowan (*4 Thornfield Terrace, Grange-over-Sands, U.K.*) on 5 January 1978. It was sent to the printer on 15 April 1980 and published on 25 September 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 167–168. No use of the plenary powers was entailed. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)4 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 167–168. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-three (23), received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Savage, Willink, Schuster, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Holthuis, Binder, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Lehtinen, Dupuis

Negative Votes—none (0).

No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

ORIGINAL REFERENCE

The original reference for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Direction is given in paragraph (1) of the Ruling above.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)4 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Direction No. 116.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
26 June 1984

DIRECTION 117

CORRECTION OF ENTRY NO. 462 IN THE OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY CONCERNING *SPHAERIUM* SCOPOLI, 1777 (MOLLUSCA, BIVALVIA) (CORRECTION TO OPINION 94)

RULING.—(1) Entry No. 462 in the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology is hereby corrected to read: *Sphaerium* Scopoli, 1777 (gender: neuter), type species, by monotypy, *Tellina cornea* Linnaeus, 1758.

(2) The generic name *Cyclas* Lamarck, [1798], a junior objective synonym of *Sphaerium* Scopoli, 1777, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2148.

(3) The family-group name CYCLADIDAE (as 'Cycladia') Rafinesque, 1820 (invalid because the name of its type genus is a junior objective synonym rejected before 1961) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 501.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1892

The present case began as an application received on 27 June 1969 from Dr Arthur H. Clarke (*National Museum of Natural Sciences, Ottawa*) for the resolution of the homonymous use of the family name SPHAERIIDAE in both Mollusca (Bivalvia) and Insecta (Coleoptera). Although this issue has not yet been resolved by two votes of the Commission, certain peripheral issues can now be cleared away as a correction to Opinion 94.

Dr Clarke asked for the use of the plenary powers to rule that SPHAERIDAE be accepted as the correct spelling of the coleopteran family name (type genus of the family, *Sphaerius* Waltl, 1838). His application was published on 7 April 1970 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 26, pp. 235–237. After the possible use of the plenary powers in the case had been duly advertised, the question was put to the vote in V.P.(71)15 on 9 June 1971. Support had been expressed by Mr David Heppell. Although Dr Clarke's proposals received a favourable vote by 15 votes to two, comments from Dr Starobogatov and Professor Tortonese caused me to re-examine the case. I found certain omissions in Dr Clarke's proposals, and put forward fresh proposals in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, pp. 60–62. These attracted a number of comments and counter-proposals which led to the issue of V.P.(84)19 on 12 March 1984. This voting paper was divided into two parts, one concerned with the molluscan names, the other with the coleopteran names. Two alternatives were offered in each part. Part 1 offered:

> Alternative A (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, p. 62, paras (2) (a), (3), (7) and (8)), namely, to place the bivalve family name SPHAERIIDAE Jeffreys, 1862(1820) on the Official List, to correct entry no. 462 in the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology, and to place the

junior objective synonyms *Cyclas* and CYCLADIDAE on the Official Index.

Alternative B (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, p. 202, paras (1), (2)(b), (3)(b), (4)(b) and (5)), namely to use the plenary powers to designate *Cyclas rivicola* Lamarck, 1818 as the type species of *Cyclas* Lamarck, [1798] with associated Official List action for *Cyclas* (and associated names) in Bivalvia and *Sphaerius* (and associated names) in Coleoptera.

At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984, the state of the voting was as follows:

For Alternative A — nineteen (19), received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Savage, Willink, Halvorsen, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Binder, Hahn, Corliss, Alvarado, Bayer, Uéno, Cogger, Kraus, Ride, Heppell, Dupuis

For Alternative B—three (3): Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Schuster. (It will be seen that this vote authorises the placing of SPHAERIIDAE Jeffreys, 1862 (1820) (type genus *Sphaerium* Scopoli, 1777) on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology. This is not being done on the present occasion because the status of that name under Article 55 remains to be clarified).

V.P.(84)19 Part 2 offered:

Alternative A: use of the plenary powers as requested in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, p. 61, para (1) with associated proposals on p. 62, paras (2)(b), (4) and (5), namely to rule that the stem of family-group names based on *Sphaerius* Waltl, 1838 (Coleoptera) is SPHAERIUS—with associated Official List action for SPHAERIUSIDAE, *Sphaerius*, and *Sphaerius acaroides* Waltl, 1838.

Alternative B: use of the plenary powers as requested in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, p. 158, para (a), with associated proposals in paras (b), (c) and (d), namely to suppress *Sphaerius* Waltl, 1838 and place on the respective Official Lists *Microsporus* Kolenati, 1846, *Microsporus obsidianus* Kolenati, 1846, and MICROSPORIDAE Reichardt, 1976.

At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

For Alternative A—ten (10) received in the following order: Halvorsen, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Binder, Hahn, Corliss, Alvarado, Cogger, Kraus

For Alternative B—ten (10) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Savage, Willink, Bayer, Schuster, Uéno, Ride, Heppell, Dupuis.

Lehtinen abstained in both parts. The votes in Part 2 by Trjapitzin and Starobogatov were invalid. No votes were returned by Bernardi and Sabrosky.

The issue in Part 2 of V.P.(84)19, which is the original issue raised by Dr Clarke, will thus have to be submitted for a third vote, in due course.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Indexes by the ruling given in the present Direction:

CYCLADIDAE (as 'Cycladia') Rafinesque, 1820, *Ann. gén. Sci. phys.*, vol. 5, p. 318 (see also Prime, T., 1851, *Proc. Boston Soc. nat. Hist.*, p. 155)

Cyclas Lamarck, [1798], *Tabl. encycl. trois règnes de la nature*, pls 301, 302.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)19 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in Part 1, Alternative A of that voting paper have been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Direction No. 117.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
30 July 1984

SPIROGLYPHUS DAUDIN, 1800 AND *STOA* DE SERRES, 1855 (MOLLUSCA, GASTROPODA, VERMETIDAE): PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF TWO EQUIVOCAL GENERIC NAMES.Z.N.(S.)2340

By A. Myra Keen (*Department of Geology, Stanford University, California 94305, U.S.A.*) and Michael G. Hadfield (*Kewalo Marine Laboratory, Pacific Biomedical Research Center, University of Hawaii, 41 Ahui Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813, U.S.A.*, to whom any enquiries or requests for offprints should be addressed)

This application seeks suppression of two nominal genera based on species not now adequately interpretable. The first is *Spiroglyphus* Daudin, 1800 (p. 39). Two species were described under it, *S. politus* (p. 49) and *S. annulatus* (p. 50, figs 28–29). Daudin considered both to be tubicolous annelids corroding a channel on other shells. He figured only one. Both were said to come from the Indian Ocean, the figured form entrenched on a fissurellid gastropod (a keyhole limpet). He had not seen living animals. Gray, 1840, cited *Spiroglyphus* as molluscan — a genus of marine snails. He allocated it to the family VERMETIDAE based on *Vermetus* which Cuvier, 1800, table 5, had also described and correctly considered a gastropod.

2. *Vermetus* was published twice in 1800: first by Cuvier: *Leçons anat. comp.* vol. 1, table 5; the date of this is taken from *J. typ. bibl.* year 3, p. 218, 30 Germinal an 8 [= 19 April, 1800], and the second by Daudin: *Recueil de mémoires et de notes sur des espèces inédites ou peu connues de Mollusques, de Vers, et de Zoophytes*, p. 34; the date of this is taken from *J. typ. bibl.* year 4, p. 43, 15 Brumaire an 9 [= 5 November, 1800].

3. Mörch, principal reviser of the VERMETIDAE in the 19th century, selecting in 1861 the figured form as type species, reinterpreted its type locality and identified it as the sole entrenching vermetid of the Caribbean area. Actually, at least three such are known there now. Moreover, there are keyhole limpets in the Indo-Pacific that match Daudin's figure well, and vermetids of both Caribbean and Indo-Pacific areas have entrenching species.

4. Faced with questions about the type locality and the morphology of the type species and having discovered that annelid specialists were likewise uncertain about Daudin's figure, one of us (Keen, 1961) suggested that the name *Spiroglyphus* should be set aside and regarded as a *genus dubium* until such time as type material could be recovered or a suitable neotype lot be selected. In the twenty years since this judgement was published, search has not revealed either Daudin's original material or a plausible specimen for replacement. Meanwhile the alternative name *Dendropoma* Mörch, 1861 (p. 153) (which then seemed preferable because it was based on extant type material in the British Museum (Natural History)), has gained currency not only among malacologists but also among ecologists and earth scientists, who are realising the usefulness of these mollusks as precise indicators of intertidal levels and hence of any shoreline changes.

5. The second generic name, *Stoa* De Serres, 1855 (p. 238) was also described as applying to tubicolous annelids that were 'perforating', i.e. entrenching. De Serres named three species but did not select any one as type species, nor has a selection been made since. He said the animals corroded channels, especially in bivalves, and that the operculum, which was intact in one specimen, was steeply conic, solid and calcareous. He commented on its lack of a pedicel or stalk such as other serpulid genera exhibited and assumed it might have broken off. If his figure was accurate, the operculum is unlike that of any known vermetid, with a marked notch on the outer margin. Mörch, 1861–1862, who dismissed *Stoa* as a synonym of two earlier names (*Spiroglyphus* Daudin, 1800 and *Siphonium* Gray, 1850) was unable to recognise any of De Serres' three species among the abundant vermetid material in European museums that he studied. His treatment of the taxon, however, was ambiguous. After synonymizing it and without defining *Stoa* as a separate unit, he cited the name subgenerically for six species, under '*Siphonium*' (actually an invalid name, preoccupied by *Siphonium* Link, 1807). He reprinted De Serres' descriptions but cited only one under the subgenus *Stoa*, the other two being considered *Spiroglyphus* by him. Subsequently, *Stoa* was cited in molluscan literature only as a synonym until 1939, when J. R. le B. Tomlin used it subgenerically for a new vermetid, again without designating the type species or supplying a diagnosis. It has not been used since.

6. De Serres stated that his specimens of *Stoa* were in the collections of the Université de Montpellier, but inquiry there has not produced any information about them. They can thus be presumed to be lost. If the operculum was as described — calcareous, steeply conic and solid — one can doubt that *Stoa* was based on molluscan material. Moreover, Fauchald, 1977, in a compilation of generic names of annelid polychaetes, lists *Stoa* under the family SPIRORBIDAE, classing it as 'invalid' and 'indeterminable'.

7. Suppression of these two names would at present seem to have no adverse effect on nomenclatural stability. No family-group names are involved. *Spiroglyphus* as a generic name in the Mollusca has appeared in only one major faunal work in the last twenty years, and the author of that work now plans (personal communication) to adopt *Dendropoma* in future editions. Meanwhile, more than a dozen journal articles have been published, by various authors, in which the name *Dendropoma* appears either in the title or the abstract. *Dendropoma* has also been used, in preference to *Spiroglyphus*, in at least four major faunal works. The late Dr Olga Hartman, a specialist on polychaete annelids, included *Spiroglyphus* in her 1959 list of possible genera (p. 47), but she regarded it as 'doubtful' (personal communication). Fauchald, 1977, did not list the name. Although *Spiroglyphus* was used by Californian palaeontologists for certain fossil annelids, this is generally conceded now to have been misidentification. The name *Stoa*, except for the ambiguous and inconsistent citation of Mörch in 1861, was used in Mollusca only once since its proposal in 1855, and then

only as an undefined subgenus. Although of doubtful status, the unit is not completely rejected by annelid specialists. It would seem, then, that suppression would not cause problems in either field. Of the two names, only *Spiroglyphus* gained any status, when it was cited in Mollusca by various authors between — roughly — 1860 and 1960. Reviving it now involves morphologic problems and, because it has priority, would require taxonomic readjustments in the classification of the family. The recommended replacement, *Dendropoma*, is based upon extant type material from known provenance, readily interpretable.

8. A number of malacologists who have been consulted on this proposed petition have offered no dissent. Their attitude seems to be that achieving stability by suppressing the names *Spiroglyphus* and *Stoa* would be preferable to trying to validate them, then having to readjust a classification that is coming into acceptance.

9. Therefore, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in the interests of current usage and nomenclatural stability, is asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.
  (a) the generic name *Spiroglyphus* Daudin, 1800, as being based upon unidentifiable material; and to place the name on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;
  (b) the generic name *Stoa* De Serres, 1855, as being based upon unidentifiable material; and to place the name on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;
  (c) the specific names *annulatus* and *politus*, as published in the binomina *Spiroglyphus annulatus* and *S. politus* Daudin, 1800, and to place them on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology;
  (d) the specific names *perforans* (p. 241), *ammonitiformis* (p. 240) and *spirulaeformis* (p. 241) as published in the binomina *Stoa perforans, S. ammonitiformis* and *S. spirulaeformis* De Serres, 1855, and to place them on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology;

(2) to place the generic name *Dendropoma* Mörch, 1861 (gender: neuter), type species, by designation of Keen, 1961, *Siphonium (D.) lituellum* Mörch, 1861 (p. 154), on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *lituellum* Mörch, 1861 as proposed in the binomen *Siphonium (Dendropoma) lituella* (specific name of type species of *Dendropoma* Mörch, 1861) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

DAUDIN, F. M. 1800. *Recueil de mémoires et de notes sur des espèces inédites ou peu connues de Mollusques, de Vers, et de Zoophytes.* Paris, privately printed, pp. 1–50, 4 pls.

DE SERRES, M. 1855. Notes sur un nouveau genre d'annélide tubicole perforant. *Ann. Sci. nat., Paris, Zool.*, ser. 4, vol. 4, pp. 238–243, 1 pl.

FAUCHALD, K. 1977. The polychaete worms: definitions and keys to the orders, families, and genera. *Los Angeles County Natural History Museum, Science Ser.*, no. 28, 188 pp., 42 figs.

GRAY, J. E. 1840. *Synopsis of the Contents of the British Museum.* London, 42nd ed. p. 118.

HARTMAN, O. 1959. Catalogue of polychaetous annelids of the world. *Allan Hancock Foundation Occasional Paper* No. 23, pt. 1, p. 47.

KEEN, A. M. 1961. A proposed reclassification of the gastropod family Vermetidae. *Bull. British Mus. (Nat. Hist.)*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 183–212, 2 pls.

MÖRCH, O. A. L. 1861–1862. Review of the Vermetidae. Part I. *Proc. Zool. Soc. London* for 1861, no. 2, pp. 145–181, Sept., 1861; Part II, *ibid*, no. 3, pp. 326–365, pl. 25, Apr., 1862; Part III, *ibid*, for 1862, no. 1, pp. 54–83, June, 1862.

CARPOPHAGA AURORAE PEALE, 1848 AND *SERRESIUS GALEATUS* BONAPARTE, 1855 (AVES): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *COLUMBA R. FORSTERI* WAGLER, 1829. Z.N.(S.)2277

By Murray D. Bruce (*8 Spurwood Road, Turramurra, N.S.W. 2074, Australia*), D. T. Holyoak (*Dept. of Geography, University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD, England*) and J.-C. Thibault (*Parc Natural Régional de Corse, Rue Général Fiorella, B.P. No 417, 20184 Ajaccio Cedex, Corse, France*).

This application is designed to preserve the long established and generally used specific names of *Carpophaga aurorae* Peale, 1848 (*U.S. Expl. Exped., Birds* vol. 8, p. 201) (type locality Aurora Island = Makatea, Tuamotu Archipelago), a fruit pigeon from Tahiti (Society Islands) and Makatea, and *Serresius galeatus* Bonaparte, 1855 (*C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris* vol. 41, p. 1110) (type locality Nuku Hiva, Marquesas Islands), a fruit pigeon from the Marquesas Islands. Both are currently placed in the genus *Ducula* (Goodwin, 1983, *Pigeons and doves of the World*, 3rd. ed., p. 320).

2. *Columba R. Forsteri* Wagler, 1829 (*Isis von Oken* col. 739) (based on *Columba globicera* var. ? of Reinhold Forster MS., from Tahiti) has been variously identified as a senior subjective synonym of both *Carpophaga aurorae* Peale, 1848 (see paragraph 5 below) and *Serresius galeatus* Bonaparte, 1855 (see paragraph 4 below).

3. According to Art. 26(d) of the Code as amended as Monaco (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 29, pp. 72–73 & 188, 1972, approving Declaration 42, 1966, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 23, pp. 198–200), an abbreviation in a compound name is to be written out in full. Hence Wagler's name would become either *reinholdiforsteri* if the given name is put in the genitive case or *reinholdforsteri* if not. Subsequent authors have mostly quoted the name as '*Columba forsteri* Wagler, 1829' which is technically incorrect. This usage invites confusion with *Columba Forsteri* Desmarest, 1826 (*Dict. Sci. nat. ed. Levrault* vol. 11, p. 340), which was proposed as a new name for *Columba porphyracea* Temminck, 1821 (*Trans. Linn. Soc. London* vol. 13, p. 130) from Tongatabu and Ulietea. *Columba Forsteri* Desmarest, 1826 has usually been regarded as an objective synonym of *Ptilinopus porphyraceus* (Temminck, 1821). The name *Columba forsterii* was also used by Prévost (in Knip, 1838–1843 *Les Pigeons* 2nd edition, vol. 2, p. 87, pl. 47) for the bird later named as *Hemiphaga forsteni* 'Temminck' Bonaparte, 1854 (*C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris* vol. 39, p. 1077).

4. *Columba R. Forsteri* Wagler, 1829 was identified as a senior subjective synonym of *Serresius galeatus* Bonaparte, 1855 by the following authors:

(1) Gray, 1859. *Cat. Bds Trop. Is. Pacific Ocean.*
(2) Wigglesworth, 1891. *Abh. Ber. K. zool. anthr. Mus. Dresden* 1890–1891 (6).

(3) Lysaght, 1957. *Ibis* vol. 99, pp. 118–120 (as '*Ducula forsteri* (Wagler), 1829', with recommendation that this name should be used to replace *Serresius galeata* [sic] Bonaparte).

5. *Columba R. Forsteri* Wagler, 1829 was identified as a senior subjective synonym of *Carpophaga aurorae* Peale, 1848 by the following authors:

(1) Salvadori, 1893. *Cat. Bds br. Mus.* vol. 21, pp. 172–173 (identified as the same as *Carpophaga wilkesii* Peale, 1848 (*U.S. Expl. Exped. Bds* vol. 8, p. 203), but with reservations; *Carpophaga wilkesii* Peale, 1848 was recognised as a junior subjective synonym of *Carpophaga aurorae* Peale, 1848 by Townsend & Wetmore (1919, *Bull. Mus. comp. Zool.* vol. 63, p. 190), Murphy (1924, *Am. Mus. Novit.* No. 115, p. 8) and Mathews (1927, *Syst. Av. Australas.* vol. 1, p. 45)).

(2) Mathews, 1927. *Syst. Av. Australas.* vol. 1, p. 45 (in synonymy of *Carpophaga aurorae* Peale, 1848 as '?*Columba forsteri* Wagler').

(3) Stresemann, 1950. *Auk* vol. 67, pp. 84–87 (as '*Ducula forsteri* (Wagler, 1829), with a recommendation that this name should not be adopted, 'for the benefit of uniformity and stability').

We believe that the latter is the correct identification because *Ducula aurorae* is the only large fruit pigeon on Tahiti and the locality of Forster's bird is given as Tahiti. However, others contend that there may formerly have been a second large species on Tahiti identical with *D. galeata* of the Marquesas Islands.

6. Forster (1844, *Descript. Animal., ed. Lichtenstein*, p. 166) gave the locality for his *Columba globicera* Varietas as 'insulae Otaheite' which Wagler quoted as 'Habitat in insula Otaheite'. Murphy (1924, *Am. Mus. Novit.* vol. 115, pp. 7–8), Mayr (1940, *Am. Nat.* vol. 74, p. 270), Amadon (1943, *Am. Mus. Novit.* No. 1237, p. 12), Thibault & Thibault (1973, *Oiseau, Rev. fr. Orn.* vol. 43, p. 67) and Holyoak (1974, *Oiseau, Rev. fr. Orn.* vol. 44, pp. 163–164; 1975, *Oiseau, Rev. fr. Orn.* vol. 45, pp. 341–344) have firmly established that *Ducula galeata* (Bonaparte) is known only from the Marquesas Islands, where *D. aurorae* (Peale) is unknown, the latter species being known with certainty only from Tahiti and Makatea. Lysaght (*op. cit.*) suggested that 'the giant pigeon [*D. galeata* auct.], found only in the Marquesas, should be known as *Ducula forsteri* (Wagner) [sic] 1829, the type locality being Tahiti'. However, there is no evidence for the former occurrence of a second species of large pigeon on Tahiti, beyond a statement rejecting the idea by Bonaparte and an unsupported suggestion of former occurrence of another form by Bruner (1972, *Field Guide to Birds of French Polynesia*, p. 67) in a popular guide produced by cyclostyling. Bonaparte (1855, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* vol. 41, p. 1111) stated: 'On a assuré à M. Jardin qu'il est plus fréquent à Otahiti; mais j'ai peine à le croire, ne trouvant du reste pas étonnant qu'un oiseau si remarquable ait un nom dans la langue d'un pays où on l'importerait seulement'.

7. The fruit-pigeon of Tahiti and Makatea has been universally known as *Carpophaga aurorae* Peale, 1848. A sample list of the literature mainly of the last fifty years but including some earlier standard works that were relied on for nomenclature is given in Appendix 1.

8. With the few exceptions noted in paragraph 4 above, the fruit-pigeon of the Marquesas Islands has been universally known as *Serresius galeatus* Bonaparte, 1855. A sample list of the literature, mainly of the last fifty years but including some earlier standard works that were relied on for nomenclature, is given in Appendix 2.

9. While a proposal to accept *Columba R. Forsteri* Wagler, 1829 in place of either *aurorae* or *galeata* (depending on which identification were accepted), would be in accordance with the Principle of Priority, either replacement would disturb stability and universality of usage and cause confusion because of the disparate views as to its identity. Art. 79 of the Code allows that a junior name may be validated in the interest of promoting stability and universality of usage or avoiding confusion. As noted in paragraph 5 above, Wagler's name has not been adopted in place of *Carpophaga aurorae* Peale, 1848 by any recent author, whereas numerous authors have used Peale's name as indicated under paragraph 7 above. Intolerable confusion could arise if *Columba R. Forsteri* Wagler, 1829 were now adopted in place of *Carpophaga aurorae* Peale, 1848 or *Serresius galeatus* Bonaparte, 1855. Even if Wagler's name (following Lysaght's view) is interpreted as a senior synonym of *Serresius galeatus* Bonaparte, 1855 (which we consider would be incorrect), usage of *galeatus* has been almost universal, as indicated in paragraph 8 above. The suppression of Wagler's name (of uncertain applicability to one or other) is preferable to a ruling that Peale's or Bonaparte's names should merely be given precedence over it, as it must apply to one or the other of the species currently known as *Ducula aurorae* or *D. galeata*. The birds of the Society Islands and the Marquesas Islands are now sufficiently well known for it to be extremely improbable that a second species of large pigeon exists in either archipelago.

10. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is, therefore, requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *R. Forsteri* Wagler, 1829, as published in the binomen *Columba R. Forsteri* Wagler, 1829, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not the Principle of Homonymy;

(2) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *aurorae* Peale, 1848, as published in the binomen *Carpophaga aurorae*;
   (b) *galeatus* Bonaparte, 1855, as published in the binomen *Serresius galeatus*;

(3) to place the specific name *R. Forsteri* Wagler, 1829, as published in the binomen *Columba R. Forsteri* and suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

APPENDIX 1

Recent and major books and papers using the specific name *aurorae* for the fruit-pigeon of the Society Islands:

SALVADORI, 1893. *Cat. Bds Br. Mus.* vol. 21, pp. 172, 180.
TOWNSEND & WETMORE, 1919. *Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool.* vol. 63, p. 190.
MURPHY, 1924. *Am. Mus. Novit.* No. 115, p. 8.
MATHEWS, 1927. *Syst. Av. Australia.* vol. 1, p. 45.
PETERS, 1937. *Checklist Bds World* vol. 3, p. 43.
MAYR, 1940. *Am. Nat.* vol. 74, p. 270.
AMADON, 1943. *Am. Mus. Novit.* No. 1237, p. 12.
GREENWAY, 1958. *Extinct and vanishing bds World*, p. 17.
GOODWIN, 1967. *Pigeons and doves World*, pp. 385, 387, 398.
THIBAULT & THIBAULT, 1973. *Oiseau, Rev. fr. Orn.* vol. 43, p. 67.
EDWARDS, 1974. *Coded list bds World*, p. 41.
HOLYOAK, 1974. *Oiseau, Rev. fr. Orn.* vol. 44, pp. 11, 163–164, 183–184.
THIBAULT, 1974. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. D* vol. 278, p. 2478.
THIBAULT & RIVES, 1975. *Bds of Tahiti*, p. 92.
THIBAULT & THIBAULT, 1975. *Oiseau, Rev. fr. Orn.* vol. 45, p. 91.
GRUSON, 1976. *Checklist Bds World*, p. 42.
HOLYOAK & THIBAULT, (1984). *Bull. Mus. natn. d'Hist. nat., Paris, sér. A.* Tome 127.

APPENDIX 2

Recent and major books and papers using the specific name *galeatus* for the fruit-pigeon of the Marquesas Islands:

SALVADORI, 1893. *Cat. Bds Br. Mus.* vol. 21, p. 171.
MURPHY, 1924. *Am. Mus. Novit.* No. 115, p. 7.
MATHEWS, 1927. *Syst. Av. Australia.* vol. 1, p. 44.
PETERS, 1937. *Checklist Bds World* vol. 3, p. 43.
ADAMSON, 1939. *Bull. Bernice P. Bishop Mus.* vol. 159, p. 64.
MAYR, 1940. *Am. Nat.* vol. 74, p. 270.
GREENWAY, 1958. *Extinct and vanishing bds World*, p. 95.
KING, 1958. *Elepaio* vol. 19, p. 16.
GOODWIN, 1967. *Pigeons and doves World*, pp. 385, 387, 399.
THIBAULT, 1973. *Bull. Soc. Et. Océaniennes, Polynésie orientale* vol. 15, p. 268.
THIBAULT, 1973. *Alauda* vol. 41, p. 314.
THIBAULT & THIBAULT, 1973. *Oiseau, Rev. fr. Orn.* vol. 43, p. 67.
EDWARDS, 1974. *Coded list bds World*, p. 41.
HOLYOAK, 1975. *Oiseau, Rev. fr. Orn.* vol. 45, pp. 215, 217, 341–344, 363.
GRUSON, 1976. *Checklist Bds World*, p. 43.
HOLYOAK & THIBAULT, (1984). *Bull. Mus. natn. d'Hist. natn., Paris, sér. A,* Tome 127.

HUMEROBATES SELLNICK, 1928 (ARACHNIDA, ACARI): MISIDENTIFICATION OF THE TYPE SPECIES *NOTASPIS HUMERALIS* HERMANN, 1804. Z.N.(S.)2374

By Roy A. Norton (*State University of New York, College of Environmental Science and Forestry, Syracuse, New York 13210, U.S.A.*)

This application is a plea for the Commission to use its plenary powers to designate *Humerobates rostrolamellatus* Grandjean, 1936 as type species of *Humerobates*, in conformity with general usage.

2. Hermann, 1804, p. 92, proposed the name *Notaspis humeralis* for an arboricolous oribatid mite species from Strasbourg, France.

3. Banks, 1895, p. 7, proposed the name *Oribata arborea* for an arboricolous oribatid mite species collected from Sea Cliff, New York, U.S.A.

4. Sellnick, 1928, p. 11, proposed the genus *Humerobates* with *Notaspis humeralis* Hermann, 1804 designated as type species.

5. Jacot, 1931, p. 379, designated *Oribata arborea* a subspecies of *H. humeralis* (sensu Sellnick). His use of the heading '*Humerobates humeralis arborea* subsp. nov.' was in error and Jacot corrected original reprints to read '*Humerobates humeralis arborea* (Banks, p. 7)'.

6. Grandjean, 1936, provided conclusive evidence, never since questioned, that the species studied and illustrated by Sellnick, 1928, was not *Notaspis humeralis*; therefore, the type species of *Humerobates* was misidentified. Grandjean, p. 79, then proposed the genus *Diapterobates* with *Trichoribates numerosus* (Sellnick) designated type species. At the same time it was suggested that *T. numerosus* was a junior subjective synonym of *Notaspis humeralis* (sensu Hermann). Grandjean, p. 77, proposed the new name *Humerobates rostrolamellatus* for the species misidentified by Sellnick and considered it to be the type species of *Humerobates* Sellnick, 1928.

7. Jacot, 1938, considered Grandjean's interpretation of the identity of *Notaspis humeralis* to be correct, but despite the misidentification implied that the rules of nomenclature required the type species of *Humerobates* to be the species bearing the name *N. humeralis*. He also implied, and later in 1940 specified, that *Humerobates* was therefore a junior synonym of *Trichoribates* Berlese, 1910 (he did not recognise Grandjean's proposed genus *Diapterobates*). The problem of the synonymy and the type species of *Trichoribates* and *Murcia* C. L. Koch, 1835 will be the subject of a later application to the Commission. To provide a generic name for *Humerobates rostrolamellatus* and its American subspecies, *H. rostrolamellatus arboreus*, Jacot, 1938, p. 14, proposed the genus *Banksinus*, with the older of the two species-group taxa, *Oribata arborea*, designated as type species. This resulted in the combinations *Banksinus arboreus* (Banks) and *B. arboreus rostrolamellatus* (Grandjean).

8. Grandjean, 1971, p. 868, proposed the family HUMEROBATIDAE consisting of the single genus *Humerobates*.

9. Since its proposal, the name *Banksinus* has been used only once in the primary zoological literature, by Jacot, 1940. In contrast, *Humerobates* has been in continuous use (in the sense of Sellnick and Grandjean) since its proposal. This includes major systematic monographs such as Willmann, 1931; Sellnick, 1960; Kunst, 1971; Balogh, 1972 and earlier papers, and Shaldybina, 1975. The latter four, and all other published systematic works dealing with this group, list *Humerobates rostrolamellatus* as type species of *Humerobates*. Approximately three dozen publications of a distributional, ecological or morphological nature have used the name *H. rostrolamellatus*. Members of this species have some minor economic significance (Massee, 1932; Krantz & Lindquist, 1979) and are considered to be bioindicators of sulphur dioxide air pollution (Lebrun *et al.*, 1978; André *et al.*, 1982).

10. Since strict adherence to nomenclatural rules would necessitate a change of the widely used name *Humerobates* and also affect the interpretation of the family name HUMEROBATIDAE, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Humerobates* Sellnick, 1928, and having done so to designate *Humerobates rostrolamellatus* Grandjean, 1936, as type species for that genus;

(2) to place the generic name *Humerobates* Sellnick, 1928 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Humerobates rostrolamellatus* Grandjean, 1936, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *rostrolamellatus* Grandjean, 1936, as published in the binomen *Humerobates rostrolamellatus* (specific name of the type species of *Humerobates* Sellnick, 1928) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

ANDRE, H. M., BOLLY, C. & LEBRUN, P. 1982. Monitoring and mapping air pollution through an animal indicator: a new and quick method. *J. appl. Ecol.*, vol. 19, pp. 107–111.

BALOGH, J. 1972. *The oribatid genera of the world.* Academiai Kiado, Budapest. pp. 1–188, 71 pl.

BANKS, N. 1895. On the Oribatoidea of the United States. *Trans Am. entomol. Soc.*, vol. 22, pp. 1–16.

GRANDJEAN, F. 1936. Les oribates de Jean Frédéric Hermann et de son père (Arachn. Acar.). *Annls Soc. entomol. France.*, vol. 105, pp. 27–110.

———1971. Nouvelles observations sur les oribates. *Acarologia*, vol. 12, pp. 849–876.

HERMANN, J. F. 1804. *Mémoire Aptérologique.* F. L. Hammer, Strasbourg, pp. 1–152, 9 pl.

JACOT, A. P. 1931. A common arboreal moss mite *Humerobates humeralis. Occ. Pap. Boston Soc. nat. Hist.*, vol. 5, pp. 369–382, 1 pl.

———1938. Some new western North Carolina moss-mites. *Proc. entomol. Soc. Washington*, vol. 40, pp. 10–15.

———1940. New oribatid mites from South Africa. *Ann. Natal Mus.*, vol. 9, pp. 391–400.

KRANTZ, G. W. & LINDQUIST, E. E. 1979. Evolution of phytophagous mites (Acari). *Ann. Rev. Entomol.*, vol. 24, pp. 121–158.

KUNST, M. 1971. Nadkohorta Pancirnici — Oribatei. *in* Daniel & Cerny. *Klic zvireny* CSSR, pp. 531–580. Ceskoslovenska Akademie Ved. Praha.

LEBRUN, P., JACQUES, J. M., GOOSSENS, M. & WAUTHY, G. 1978. The effect of interaction between the concentration of SO_2 and the relative humidity of air on the survival of the bark-living bio-indicator mite *Humerobates rostrolamellatus. Wat. Air Soil Poll.*, vol. 10, pp. 269–275.

MASSEE, A. M. 1932. Some injurious and beneficial mites on top and soft fruits. *J. Pomol.*, vol. 10, pp. 106–129.

SELLNICK, M. 1928. Formenkreis: Hornmilben, Oribatei. *Tierwelt Mitteleur.*, vol. 3, lief. 4, pp. 1–42.

———1960. Formenkreis: Hornmilben, Oribatei. *Tierwelt Mitteleur.*, vol. 3, lief. 4, pp. 45–134.

SHALDYBINA, E. S. 1975. Family Ceratozetidae, *in: A key to the soil-inhabiting mites. Sarcoptiformes.* Nauka, Moscow. pp. 277–303.

WILLMANN, C. 1931. Moosmilben oder Oribatiden (Oribatei). *Tierwelt Dtl.*, vol. 22, pp. 79–200.

HATSCHEKIA POCHE, 1902 (CRUSTACEA, COPEPODA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *PSEUDOCLAVELLA* BASSETT-SMITH, 1898 Z.N.(S.)2390

By J. B. Jones (*Fisheries Research Division, P.O. Box 297, Wellington, New Zealand*)

The purpose of this application is to retain the generic name *Hatschekia* Poche, 1902 and to suppress as a forgotten name *Pseudoclavella* Bassett-Smith, 1898.

2. In 1898 Bassett-Smith (1898, pp. 92–96) proposed a new genus and species of parasitic copepod, *Pseudoclavella ovalis*, two syntype specimens of which he deposited in the British Museum (Natural History) (Cat. no. 98.12.2.13). Unfortunately, although his description of the specimens was reasonably accurate, his illustrations were poor.

3. Poche (1902, pp. 16–17) recognising the composite nature of *Clavella* Oken, 1815 as it was then constituted, and without any reference to *Pseudoclavella*, proposed the removal of four species of *Clavella* to a new genus which he named *Hatschekia*, designating *C. hippoglossi* Krøyer, 1838 as the type species. Krøyer's specimens no longer exist, but the species is common and well described.

4. Meanwhile, Brian (1902, p. 38), also without reference to *Pseudoclavella*, proposed the transfer of seven species of *Cycnus* to *Clavella*, and these were subsequently transferred to *Hatschekia* by Goggio (1905, pp. 215–217).

5. Goggio noticed the similarity between certain *Hatschekia* species and *Pseudoclavella*, and in a note (1905, p. 219) remarked, 'Veramente questa specie si avvicina, come del resto anche la *Hatschekia* (*Clavella*) *labracis* Van Ben., al genere *Pseudoclavella* Bassett-Smith (reference) per la presenza delle appendici addominali: la colloco pero nel genere *Hatschekia* perche, fra l'altro, queste sono rappresentate da un solo paio, mentre al posta del 2 paio di appendici addominali non si trovano tutt'al piu che due setole'. Had Goggio access to the type of *Pseudoclavella* he would undoubtably have transferred *H. labracis* and *H. cernae* into *Pseudoclavella* and the rest of *Hatschekia* would eventually have followed.

6. By the time Wilson (1922) published his review of the North American DICHELESTHIIDAE, there were 25 recognised species of *Hatschekia* and one species of *Pseudoclavella*. Wilson, in comparing the genera within this family, apparently relied heavily on Bassett-Smith's illustrations, and (p. 9) listed a number of differences between *Pseudoclavella* and *Hatschekia*, particularly in the structure of the antenna II and the third and fourth legs.

7. Yamaguti (1963) was also misled by the structure of the third and fourth legs and transferred *Pseudoclavella* to the PSEUDOCYCNIDAE (p. 171). *Hatschekia* (Yamaguti, 1963, pp. 135–140) had grown to approximately 75 described species.

8. Pillai (1969, pp. 171–172) finally re-examined the type specimen of *Pseudoclavella ovalis* and transferred the species to *Hatschekia* without commenting on the problems of priority that might occur.

9. *Hatschekia* now contains about 100 species. Since 1960 the following authors have described species ascribed to *Hatschekia*:

Kabata, 1981, 1979, 1965
Ho & Dojiri, 1978
Cressey, 1970
Hewitt, 1969
Lewis, 1967
Yamaguti & Yamasu, 1960

The genus was transferred to a new family HATSCHEKIIDAE, by Kabata (1979). *Pseudoclavella*, while always recognised as a valid genus, has never been used as a senior synonym of *Hatschekia*.

10. The present application seeks to place the proposal of Pillai (1969) on a proper footing. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Pseudoclavella* Bassett-Smith, 1898 for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the generic name *Hatschekia* Poche, 1902 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Clavella hippoglossi* Krøyer, 1838;

(3) to place the specific name *hippoglossi* Krøyer, 1838, as published in the binomen *Clavella hippoglossi* (specific name of the type species of *Hatschekia* Poche, 1902) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the generic name *Pseudoclavella* Bassett-Smith, 1898, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BASSETT-SMITH, P. W. 1898. Further new parasitic copepods found on fish in the Indo-tropical region. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* ser. 7, vol. 2, pp. 77–98.

BRIAN. A. 1902. Note su alcuni Crostacei parassiti dei Pesci del Mediterraneo. *Atti Soc. ligust. Sci. nat. geogr.*, vol. 13, pp. 30–45, 1 plate.

CRESSEY, R. F. 1970. *Hatschekia pacifica* new species (Copepoda, Caligoida) a parasite of the sand bass, *Paralebrax nebulifer* (Giard). *Proc. biol. Soc. Wash.*, vol. 82(66), pp. 843–846.

GOGGIO, E. 1905. Intorno al genere *Clavella* Oken (*Hatschekia* Poche). *Archo. zool. ital.*, vol. 2, pp. 215–225, 4 figs.

HEWITT, G. C. 1969. Two new species of *Hatschekia* (Copepoda, Dichelesthiidae) from New Zealand waters. *N.Z. Jl mar. freshw. Res.*, vol. 3, pp. 159–168.

HO, J. S. & DOJIRI, M. 1978. A new species of *Hatschekia* (Copepoda, Dichelesthiidae) parasitic on leopard coral trout in the Great Barrier Reef, Australia. *J. Parasitol.*, vol. 64(4), pp. 727–730.

KABATA, Z. 1965. Parasitic Copepoda of Fishes. *Rep. B.A.N.Z. Antarctic. Res. Exped.*, ser. B, vol. 8(6), pp. 1–16.

———1979. *Parasitic Copepoda of British Fishes.* London BM(NH) for The Ray Society, monograph 152, i–xii, 468 pp., 2031 figs.

———1981. Relegation of *Hatschekia acuta* Barnard, 1948 to synonymy with *Hatschekia conifera* Yamaguti, 1939. (Copepoda: Syphonostomatoida). *Can. J. Zool.*, vol. 59(11), pp. 2080–2084.

LEWIS, A. G. 1967. Copepod crustaceans parasitic on teleost fishes of the Hawaiian Islands. *Proc. U.S. Natn. Mus.*, vol. 121, pp. 1–204.

PILLAI, N. K. 1969. Notes on some copepod parasites in the collection of the British Museum (N.H.), London. *J. mar. biol. Ass. India,* vol. 11(1–2), pp. 149–174, 138 figs.

POCHE, F. VAN. 1902. Bemerkungen zu der Arbeit des Herrn Bassett-Smith, A Systematic Description of Parasitic Copepoda found on Fishes, with an Enumeration of the known Species. *Zool. Anz.*, vol. 26, pp. 8–20.

WILSON, C. B. 1922. North American parasitic copepods belonging to the family Dichelesthiidae. *Proc. U.S. Natn. Mus.*, vol. 60, art. 5, pp. 1–100.

YAMAGUTI, S. 1963. *Parasitic Copepoda and Branchiura of Fishes.* Interscience, New York, 1104 pp.

———& YAMASU, T. 1960. New parasitic copepods from Japanese fishes. *Publs Seto mar. biol. Lab.*, vol. 8, pp. 141–152.

THE DESCRIPTION OF NEW TAXA ON ENZYME DATA: A MATTER FOR DISCUSSION. Z.N.(S.)2458

(1) By Jens Erik Jelnes (*Thyborøn Alle 82, 2720 Vanloese, Denmark*)

The widespread use of isoenzyme techniques, electrophoresis and isoelectric focusing, in studies of molecular biology has had an impact on studies in taxonomy and phylogeny of species in different animal groups. As early as 1963, Manwell & Baker discovered two sibling species of the sea cucumber *Thyonella gemmata* using starch gel electrophoresis. In their study they were able to relate the isoenzyme pattern to some differences in morphology. The first formal description of new taxa on the basis of isoenzyme pattern (Ayala, 1973) were two subspecies of the *Drosophila willistoni* group. Since then, several studies using the isoenzyme technique have revealed the presence of sibling species within what was considered one morphological species; generally, these discoveries were made on sympatric material. Grassle & Grassle, 1976, found the polychaete *Capitella capitella* to be composed of six sibling species, the oligochaete *Lumbricillus rivalis* was shown to be composed of three sibling species (Christensen & Jelnes, 1976), the prosobranch *Goniobasis floridensis* consists of two species (Chambers, 1978). It is beyond the scope of this contribution to mention all such cases, but it is due time, through a debate, to obtain some agreement on procedures for describing taxa, if necessary, solely from enzymic evidence. In literature one can find examples where diagnostic enzymes can not readily be examined by other workers due to inadequate description of the methodology used. It would be fruitful if the suggestions resulting from the discussion opened by this paper could be included in the International Code for zoological nomenclature.

2. What is to be discussed applies *only* to the formal description of new taxa, although the recommendations might have an impact on other isozymic work.

3. The first four recommendations suggested apply to the reproducibility of diagnostic enzyme characters. This is of great importance, as a zoological taxon should be described from diagnostic characters that are readily recognisable for colleagues. It does not suffice to state that 18 specified enzymes were investigated using 11 different buffers. It might well be that an enzyme is diagnostic in one buffer but not in another, e.g. the enzyme glutamate–oxaloacetate transaminase has clearly different mobilities in the species *Bulinus tropicus* and *B. permembranaceus* using buffer C (Jelnes, 1979), whereas the enzyme mobilities are identical using buffer B (Henriksen & Jelnes, 1980) (unpublished observations).

4. I therefore suggest the four following recommendations:

(1) gel medium (starch, polyacryl amide, cellulose acetate, etc.) and gel concentration (where applicable) should be clearly specified, preferably with the name of the manufacturer;

(2) chemical composition of buffers used, either in grams per litre or molarity, as well as pH of the buffers, should be clearly stated;

(3) it should appear clearly in which gels, characterised by the buffer, the different enzymes are stained, and what the staining mixture is composed of;

(4) the procedure of scoring should be indicated. Is it (a) relative mobility to a standard marker, (b) relative mobility to the corresponding enzyme of a specified strain, (c) direct comparison between enzyme bands between the different taxa on the gels, or (d) isoelectric point.

The last three recommendations suggested apply to the concept of the holotype. It is fully realised that these might not apply to all groups of animals, but it is of importance for possible later morphological studies that some material be preserved, labelled properly according to the ICZN as holotype and paratypes.

(5) if possible, not whole animals, but parts of no obvious morphological significance, should be used for enzyme studies. The part of one individual that is not used should be preserved and labelled as the holotype, and those of other individuals from the same locality of similar phenotype or genotype, should be kept and labelled as paratypes;

(6) if whole animals have to be used for enzyme studies, care should be taken to select the type locality as a locality where only the new taxon is found, i.e. without closely related species. This has to be shown by analysis of a number of specimens. The holotype and paratypes can then be designated from the remaining individuals of the collection, constituting only the new taxon as revealed enzymewise;

(7) A photograph of the zymograms showing the diagnostic characters should be provided along with the description, preferably showing the band position(s) of the related species as well.

5. There is no doubt that in the future, enzymic characters will come to play a more important role in systematic work. For those unacquainted with the use of enzymic data in systematics, Avise, 1974, has provided an informative account. I shall look forward to a hopefully fruitful debate on the subject.

REFERENCES

AVISE, J. C. 1974. Systematic value of electrophoretic data. *Systematic Zoology*, vol. 23, pp. 465–481.

AYALA, F. J. 1973. Two new subspecies of the *Drosophila willistoni* group (Diptera: Drosophilidae). *Pan–Pacific Entomol.*, vol. 49, pp. 273–279.

CHAMBERS, S. M. 1978. An electrophoretically detected sibling species of *'Goniobasis floridensis'* (Mesogastropoda: Pleuroceridae). *Malacologia*, vol. 17, pp. 157–162.

CHRISTENSEN, B. & JELNES, J. E. 1976. Sibling species in the oligochaete worm *Lumbricillus rivalis* revealed by enzyme polymorphism and breeding experiments. *Hereditas*, vol. 83, pp. 237–244.

GRASSLE, J. P. & GRASSLE, J. F. 1976. Sibling species in the marine pollution indicator *Capitella* (Polychaeta). *Science*, vol. 192, pp. 567–569.

HENRIKSEN, U. B. & JELNES, J. E. 1980. Experimental taxonomy of *Biomphalaria* (Gastropoda: Planorbidae) I. Methods for experimental taxonomic studies on *Biomphalaria* carried out by horizontal starch gel electrophoresis and staining of twelve enzymes. *J. Chromatogr.*, vol. 188, pp. 169–176.

JELNES, J. E. 1979. Experimental taxonomy of *Bulinus*. II. Recipes for horizontal starch gel electrophoresis of ten enzymes in *Bulinus* and description of internal standard systems and two new species of the *Bulinus forskalii* complex. *J. Chromatogr.*, vol. 170, pp. 405–411.

MANWELL, C. & BAKER, C. M. A. 1963. A sibling species of sea cucumber discovered by starch gel electrophoresis. *Comp. Bioch. Physiol.*, vol. 10, pp. 39–53.

(2) by Renaud Fortuner (*Department of Food & Agriculture, 1220 N Street, Room 340, Sacramento CA 95814, U.S.A.*)

A zoological name published after 1930 is available only if it is 'accompanied by a description or definition that states in words the characters that are purported to differentiate the taxon' (Article 13a(i)). The type affords the standard of reference that determines the application of the name (Article 61). It is evident that the differentiating characters given in the original description of a taxon must be visible in the type of this taxon. This is generally the case in taxa described and differentiated from purely morphological data. If a scientist suspects errors in the description of a taxon he may study his type and propose his own interpretation of the morphological data.

2. Nowadays, however, more and more non-morphological characters are used to differentiate new taxa. Recently the nematode species *Radopholus citrophilus* was established by Huettel, Dickson & Caplan, 1984 (*Proc. helminthol. Soc. Washington*, vol. 51, pp. 32–35) and differentiated by its chromosome number and by seven diagnostic loci in starch gel electrophoresis. These characters are not visible in the traditional glycerine mounts that constitute the type and the type series of the new species.

3. I ask the Commission to study this problem and to provide means for checking the accuracy of the description of a new taxon based on such non-morphological criteria. The type series might be allowed to include photographs or permanent mounts showing chromosomes or protein migration; or a living culture of the type population might be maintained, from which fresh specimens could be taken and processed to verify chromosomes or proteins. Whatever solution is eventually found, I think it is important to give the new criteria equal status with the traditional morphological criteria.

AUTHORSHIP AND DATES OF THE SOWERBYS' *MINERAL CONCHOLOGY OF GREAT BRITAIN*. Z.N.(S.)2483

By C. W. Wright (*The Old Rectory, Seaborough, Beaminster, Dorset DT8 3QY*) & R. J. Cleevely (*British Museum (Natural History), London SW7 5BD*)

The Mineral Conchology of Great Britain, published between 1812 and 1845, is recognised to be of fundamental importance in British invertebrate palaeontology, containing as it does 640 plates and the descriptions of many fossil invertebrates, the majority of them new.

2. The work was issued irregularly in parts. On the covers of the individual parts, James Sowerby was given as the sole author up to Part 70 which has the printed date of 1 May 1823. Thereafter the covers include the phrase 'continued by J. de C. Sowerby'; Part 71 is dated 1 June 1823. In fact, James Sowerby died on 25 October 1822. An indication of the consequent change is given on the back cover of Part 66 (dated 1 November 1822) when 'Messrs. Sowerby' make the customary request for information previously requested by James Sowerby.

3. The dates of issue of the parts are of importance in questions of priority. In 1855 Renevier, after examining the set of parts in the British Museum and then consulting James de Carle Sowerby, published a list of dates for the parts of the *Mineral Conchology* in the *Bull. Soc. vaudoise Sci. nat.* but only referred to the plate numbers they contained. R. B. Newton, 1891, produced a table listing the parts and plates that were published in each year. Sykes in 1906, after examining the only known surviving set of the original wrappers, published a more detailed list that revised the plate groupings for parts in volumes 4, 5 and 6. Minor amendments to that list have been made by Cleevely, 1974, who also emphasised that the printed dates cannot be entirely relied upon but have to be accepted without other evidence.

4. Renevier, 1855, attributed all the plates and descriptions up to pl. 383 (in Part 66, dated November 1822) to James Sowerby and all subsequent plates beginning with pl. 384 (in Part 67, dated January 1823) to J. de C. Sowerby. R. B. Newton, 1891 p. 323, stated that James Sowerby completed Nos. 1–65 and that after his death in 1822, the subsequent portions Nos. 66–113, were brought out by his son, James de Carle Sowerby. Sykes, 1906, did not refer to the change in authorship. Sherborn noted in his copy of Renevier's paper that plate 377 was the last described by James Sowerby and in his *Index animalium,* 1922–33, he gave J. de C. Sowerby as the author of all the new species described in Part 66 and subsequently.

5. In a published letter commenting on the pirated editions of the *Mineral Conchology* that were issued by Agassiz, J. de C. Sowerby, 1839,

gave an account of the method employed by the family in producing material for the work:

> 'The author James Sowerby being much more partial to the pictorial department, referred the principal part of the text to his two eldest sons, myself and Mr G. B. Sowerby, while he executed the plates wholly himself: and he continued his task regularly, even during a long and painful illness until within three or four days of his death in 1822... For some time previous to this sad event, it had fallen to my lot to describe the whole of the shells, and now I was obliged, in addition, to engrave the plates, a few only having been done in advance by my father.'

However, while this passage throws some light on the way in which the text was drafted it cannot be taken as giving conclusive evidence on authorship; there is no evidence either way whether James Sowerby read through or took responsibility for the publication of the parts issued in 1822 that carried his name on their covers.

6. It has been suggested (Cleevely, 1974) that in view of J. de C. Sowerby's remarks, the authorship of the seven new molluscan species described in Part 66, i.e. pl. 378: *Cypraea coccinelloides, C. retusa, C. avellana* [all now *Trivia*]; Pl. 379: *Auricula pyramidalis* [=*Melampus*]; Pl. 381: *Plagiostoma rusticum* and Pl. 382 *Plagiostoma laeviusculum* [both =*Lima*]: Pl. 383: *Gryphaea nana* [=*Nanogyra*] should be attributed to him. However, on the same basis it could be argued that for an undefined period before the death of James Sowerby the authorship of all new names ought to be attributed to James, James de Carle and G. B. Sowerby.

7. The change of authorship from James to J. de C. Sowerby is thus given by:

(i) Renevier, 1855, as from pl. 384, dated 1 January 1823;
(ii) Newton, 1891; Sherborn, 1922–33; and Cleevely, 1974, as from pl. 378. dated 1 February 1822 [but known to be later];
(iii) the printed wrappers of the *Mineral Conchology* itself, as from pl. 408, dated 1 June 1823.

Such confusion is intolerable. Unless a ruling is given, future authors on the basis of published statements will be free to choose between these three alternatives and between the various sets of publication dates.

8. It has to be assumed that the only basis that Newton and Sherborn had for their action of changing the authorship of the species described in Part 66 is the evidence mentioned in paragraph 5 above and the date of James Sowerby's death. Neither of these authors provided any other information, nor is there any document in the volumes of Mss Notes & Correspondence relating to the *Evidence of Dates of Books* accumulated by C. D. Sherborn to substantiate his action.

9. In accordance with accepted practice the evidence of the covers as to authorship should be followed, but, to the best of our knowledge, for many years all authors have accepted either Renevier's or Sherborn's date

for the change of author. Arkell, 1934, p. viii, specifically followed Renevier and in fact, all recent usage has adopted the same practice, e.g.: Harmer, 1925; Arkell, [1930]; Cox & Arkell, 1948; the compilers of *British Cainozoic Fossils*, 1959 & 1975; H. B. Stenzel in the *Treatise of Invertebrate Palaeontology*, Part N, 1971; Duff, 1975.

10. It might be argued that a simple method of overcoming the difficulty over authorship would be to refer all new species in the *Mineral Conchology* to 'Sowerby' thereby avoiding the need for establishing the particular member in that family who was responsible. However, general usage over many years has been to differentiate between James and James de Carle Sowerby. Further, the adoption of such a practice would not allow for the differing degree of palaeontological understanding of father and son that in part was the result of the development of the science over the period during which the *Mineral Conchology* was published.

11. For the removal of uncertainty over authorship and to ensure stability of nomenclature, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is requested to rule that:

(a) the publication dates of the pages and plates of the *Mineral Conchology of Great Britain*, 1812–1845, are to be taken as set out by Cleevely, 1974 (and reproduced here as an Appendix);

(b) the change of authorship from James to James de Carle Sowerby is to be taken as stated by Renevier in 1855; thus, all species described and figured in vols 1 to 3 and vol. 4, pages 1–114 and plates 1 to 383 (parts 1 to 66) are to be attributed to James Sowerby and all those described and figured in subsequent pages and plates are to be attributed to James de Carle Sowerby.

REFERENCES

ARKELL, W. J. 1929–37. A monograph of British Corallian Lamellibranchs. *Monogr. palaeontogr. Soc.*, London. xxxviii + 392 pp., 55 pls.

———1934. Ammonites of the English Corallian Beds. Part 1. *Monogr. palaeontogr. Soc.*, London; xxxii + 30 pp., pls. A–B, i–vi.

BRITISH MUSEUM (Natural History), 1961. *British Cainozoic Fossils*. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.), London, 1st ed. 1961; 5th ed. 1975: vi + 132 pp., 44 pls.

CLEEVELY, R. J. 1974. The Sowerbys, the *Mineral Conchology*, and their fossil collection. *Jl. Soc. Biblphy. nat Hist.*, vol. 6 (6), pp. 418–481.

COX, L. R. & ARKELL, W. J. 1948. A Survey of the Mollusca of the British Great Oolite series . . . A Nomenclatorial Revision . . . Pt. 1. *Monogr. Palaeontogr. Soc.*, London, xxiii + 105 + [xlii] pp.

DUFF, K. L. 1975. Palaeoecology of a bituminous shale—the Lower Oxford Clay of central England. *Palaeontology*, vol. 18 (3), pp. 443–482.

HARMER, F. W. 1920–25. The Pliocene Mollusca of Great Britain. Vol. 2, Supplement to S. V. Wood, Monograph of the Crag Mollusca. *Monogr. palaeontogr. Soc.*, London, pp. i–xiii + 485–856.

NEWTON, R. B. 1891. *Systematic list of the F. E. Edwards collection of British Oligocene and Eocene mollusca in the British Museum (Natural History).* Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.), London, xxviii + 365 pp.

PALMER, K. V. W. 1966. Who were the Sowerbys? *Sterkiana,* No. 23: 1–6.

RENEVIER, E. 1855. Dates de la publication des espèces contenues dans les planches de la Conchologie minéralogique de la Grande Bretagne. *Bull. Soc. vaudoise Sci. nat.,* vol. 4, pp. 318–320.

SHERBORN, C. D. 1922–1933. *Index animalium, 1801–1850.* Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.), London, 9 vols.
[*Cypraea avellana:* p. 620; *Cypraea coccinelloides*: p. 1376; *Plagiostoma laeviusculum:* p. 3380; *Gryphaea nana:* p. 4248; *Auricula pyramidalis:* p. 5334; *Cypraea retusa:* p. 5487; *Plagiostoma rusticum:* p. 5697.]

———MSS Notes and Correspondence. Evidence of Dates of Books. 2 vols. B.M.(N.H.) Palaeontology Library. [Amongst the items relating to the *Mineral Conchology* [690–697] only the annotated copy of Renevier's pamphlet and a letter from Professor Renevier dated 12 October 1888 have any bearing.]

SOWERBY, J. de C. 1839. Letter on the subject of the French Edition of the Mineral Conchology. *Mag. nat. Hist.,* London, New Ser., vol. 3, pp. 418–420.

STENZEL, H. 1971. *Treatise on Invertebrate Palaeontology, Part N, Mollusca* 6, Vol. 3; *Oysters.* Geol. Soc. Amer. & Univ. Kansas, Lawrence, pp. i–iv + N953–N1224.

SYKES, E. R. 1906. On the dates of publication of Sowerby's *'Mineral Conchology'* and *'Genera of Recent and Fossil shells'. Proc. malacol. Soc. Lond.,* vol. 7, pp. 191–194.

APPENDIX

PUBLICATION DATES OF THE MINERAL CONCHOLOGY

Based on Sykes (1906) and the full set of wrappers in the B.M.(N.H.)

Vol. I: 18 Parts

Part	Plates	Pages	Date
1	1–3*	i–vii, 9–16	June 1st, 1812
2	4–9	17–32	Aug. 1st
3	10–15	33–48	Feb. 1st, 1813
4	16–21	49–60	Apr. 1st
5	22–27	61–72	June 1st
6	28–33	73*–76*, 73–84	Aug. 1st
7	33 bis, 34–38	73**–84**	Oct. 1st
8	39–44	85–96	Dec. 1st
9	45–50	97–108	Feb. 1st, 1814
10	51–56	109–124	Apr. 1st
11	57–62	125–140	June 1st
12	63–67**	141–152	Aug. 1st
13	68–73	153–168	Oct. 1st
14	74–78**	169–178	Dec. 1st
15	79–84	179–194	Feb. 1st, 1815
16	85–90	195–202	Apr. 1st
17	91–96	203–218	June 1st
18	97–102	219–234, & Index to Vol. [pp. 2]	Aug. 1st

Vol. II: 17 Parts

19	103–108	1–12	Oct. 1st, 1815
	Includes Supplementary Index to Vol. 1: 8		
20	109–114	13–28	Dec 1st
21	115–120	29–44	Feb. 1st, 1816
22	121–126	45–60	Apr. 1st
23	127–132	61–72	June 1st
24	133–138	[73–84] = 77–78	Aug. 1st
25	139–144	85–100	Oct. 1st
26	145–150	101–116	Dec. 1st
27	151–156	117–128	Feb. 1st, 1817
28	157–162	129–140	Apr. 1st
29	163–168	141–154	June 1st
30	169–174	155–166	Aug. 1st
31	175–180	167–178	Oct. 1st
32	181–184, 184A, 185–186φ	179–194	Dec. 1st
33	187–192	195–210	Feb. 1st, 1818
34	193–198	211–224	Apr. 1st
35	199–203**	225–235 & Index to Vol. II: [237–239]	June 1st

N.B. Supplementary Index to Vol. II (pp. 240–251) appeared in No. 38 (Dec. 1st, 1818).

Vol. III: 18 Parts

36	204–209	1–16	Aug. 1st, 1818
37	210–215	17–28	Oct. 1st
38	216–221	29–40	Dec. 1st
39	222–227	41–48	Feb. 1st, 1819
40	228–233	49–58	Apr. 1st
41	234–239	59–68	June 1st
42	240–245	69–80	Aug. 1st
43	246–248*	81–88	Oct. 1st
44	249–253**	89–98	Dec. 1st
45	254–259	99–106	Feb. 1st, 1820
46	260–265	107–118	Apr. 1st
47	266–271	119–126	May 1st
48	272–277	127–138	May 1st, 1821
49	278–283	139–150	June 1st
50	284–289	151–162	July 1st
51	290–294**	163–166, 166*–167* 167–170	Aug. 1st
52	295–300	171–178	Sept. 1st
53	301–306	179–184 & Index to Vol. III: [185–186]	Oct. 1st

Supplementary Index to Vol. III published in No. 61 (June 1st, 1822): 187–194

Vol. IV: 17 Parts

54	307–312	1–8	Nov. 1st, 1821
55	313–318	9–16	Dec. 1st
56	319–324	17–24	Jan. 1st, 1822
57	325–330	25–32	Feb. 1st
58	331–336	33–44	Mar. 1st
59	337–342	45–56	Apr. 1st
60	343–348	57–68	May 1st
61	349–354	69–76	June 1st
62	355–359**	77–82	July 1st
63	360–365	83–90	Aug. 1st
64	366–371	89b, 91–96	Sept. 1st
65	372–377	97–104	Oct. 1st

66	378–383	105–114	Nov. 1st

67	384–388**	115–122	Jan. 1st, 1823
68	389–394	123–130	Feb. 1st
69	395–400	131–138	Apr. 1st
70	401–407φ	139–148 & Index to Vol. IV: [149–151]	May 1st

Supplementary index to Vol. IV published in No. 73 (Aug. 1st 1823): 153–160

Vol. V: 16 Parts

71	408–413	1–12	June 1st, 1823
72	414–419	13–20	July 1st
73	420–425	21–32	Aug. 1st
74	426–431	33–40	Sept. 1st
75	432–437	41–48	Nov. 1st
76	438–443	49–64	Dec. 1st
77	445–450	65–72	Jan. 1st, 1824
78	*444, 451–455	63*–64*, 73–78	Mar. 1st
79	456–461	79–90	Apr. 1st
80	462–467	91–98	May 1st
81	468–473	99–114	Aug. 1st
82	474–479	115–130	Nov. 1st
83	480–485	131–138	Dec. 1st
84	486–491	139–144	Mar. 1st, 1825
85	492–497	145–152	May 1st
86	498–503	153–168 & Index to Vol. V: [169–171]	Sept. 1st

* Note on cover = "this table was accidentally passed over in No. 77, which should have begun with it".

Vol. VI: 19 parts

87	504–509	1–12	Feb. 1st, 1826
88	510–515	13–28	Mar. 1st
89	516–521	29–36	Apr. 1st
90	522–527	37–44	May 1st
91	528–533	45–50	July 1st
92	534–539	51–76	Sept. 1st
93	540–545	77–86	Nov.,1st
94	546–551	87–96	Jan. 1st, 1827
95	552–557	97–108	Mar. 1st
96	558–562**	109–120	May 1st
97	563–568	121–132	Aug. 1st
98	569–574	133–140	Sept. 1st
99	575–580	141–156	Nov. 1st
100	581–586	157–164	Jan. 1st, 1828
101	587–591	165–184	June 1st
102	592–597	185–200	Aug. 1st
103	598–603	201–214	Jan. 1st, 1829
104	604–609	215–230, Title & Index to Vol. VI: [231–235]	July 1st, 1829

105 Portrait of James Sowerby: Preface to the General Indexes and the Systematical Index to the Six volumes by J. de C. Sowerby: [239]–250 Aug 1st, 1835

Vol. VII: 8 Parts

106	610–613†	Alphabetical Index to the first 6 vols.: 1–11	March, 1840
107	614–618**	1–8	Oct. 1840
108	619–623**	9–16	Mar. 1841
109	624–628**	17–24	Feb. 1843
110	629–633**	25–40	Jan. 1844
111	634–638**	41–48	Mar. 1844
112	639–643**	49–56	Nov. 1844
113	644–648	57–80	Jan. 1846

All parts contain 6 pls, except for those marked * = 3, ** = 5, φ = 7, † = 4

HYMENOLEPIS WEINLAND, 1858 (CESTODA): PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES. Z.N.(S.)1156

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
(CIOMS Case No. 1)

There are two reasons why the Commission should give urgent consideration to the generic name *Hymenolepis* Weinland, 1858. The first is connected with the work of the Council of International Organisations of Medical Sciences, an affiliate of the World Health Organisation. This Council is drawing up an international nomenclature of diseases, in several volumes. Vol. II, part 4 deals with the parasitic diseases of the human species. The Commission's Secretariat has undertaken to verify the nomenclatural status of the scientific names involved (some 700 in number), excluding names in the order-class group. The second reason is that *Hymenolepis* was placed on the Official List by the ruling given in Opinion 77 (*Smiths. misc. Colls*, vol. 73(1), pp. 71–73, 1922); but when the first instalment of the Official List of Generic names in Zoology in book form was being prepared in 1958, the entry concerning *Hymenolepis* was found to be defective. The name was therefore given a number on the Official List (No. 243) but full publication of the entry was deferred.

2. The entry for *Hymenolepis* in Opinion 77 reads in full:

> '*Hymenolepis* Weinland, 1858a, 52; tsd *Taenia diminuta* Rud., 1819a, 689 (type host *Mus rattus*: Brazil). [HSW; S.]'

This is to be interpreted as follows: the references '1858a' and '1819a' are to the comprehensive bibliography published by Stiles & Hassall, 1902, in the *Index Catalogue of Medical and Veterinary Zoology*; 'tsd' means type [species] by subsequent designation; 'HSW; S' means that the case had been studied by a committee of the Helminthological Society of Washington and by Stiles.

3. The facts are that *Hymenolepis* was established by Weinland, 1858, pp. 49–57, by a lengthy discussion and description. Only one species, *H. flavopunctata* Weinland, 1858, ibid., is referred to the genus in the text, but in a footnote to p. 52 is found: 'The Taenioids belonging to this genus live in insectivorous Mammalia and birds, and we may distinguish two subgenera, which separate pretty well those of the Mammalia from those of the birds, viz.: Subg. 1, *Lepidotrias* Weinl. . . . Nearly all the species living in insectivorous Mammalia. As the type we may consider *Taenia murina,* Dujardin; and besides this belong here [10 previously described species] and *Hymenolepis flavopunctata*. Subg. 2, *Dilepis* Weinl. . . . The tapeworms of this subgenus live particularly in insectivorous birds and we may consider *Taenia angulata* Rudolphi as its type.' Three other previously described species were referred to *Dilepis*.

4. It will be seen that *Taenia diminuta* Rudolphi was not originally included in the genus and therefore that it cannot be the type species under

Article 67g. The type species, by original designation, is clearly *Taenia murina* Dujardin, and *Lepidotrias* is a junior objective synonym of *Hymenolepis*.

5. Stiles further misunderstood the situation when he said (1896, p. 32): 'Weinland proposed this genus, with *Taenia flavopunctata* as type, but as this form is identical with *Taenia diminuta* the name *H. diminuta* is here inserted as type species.' This has been accepted ever since. As *Hymenolepis* has been used in this sense in many hundreds of works, and is still so used, it is clearly desirable to regularise this usage. *H. diminuta* and *H. nana* (von Siebold, 1852) occur in humans and present medical problems. *Lepidotrias* does not appear ever to have been used.

6. The family-group name HYMENOLEPIDINAE (as 'Hymenolepinae') was established by Perrier, [1896], p. 1852.

7. According to Burt, 1980, the *H. diminuta* infests some 70 species and subspecies of mammals, including humans, and some birds, and is found in all countries. The larva infests some 57 species of insects, some of which are closely associated with humans. There is recent evidence of pathological effects in humans at the physiological and biochemical levels. He lists 348 references, about 75% of which have appeared in the last 50 years; they are by many different authors.

8. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all fixations of type species hitherto made for *Hymenolepis* Weinland, 1858 and to designate *Taenia diminuta* Rudolphi, 1819 as type species of that genus;

(2) to place the generic name *Hymenolepis* Weinland, 1858 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Taenia diminuta* Rudolphi, 1819, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:

(3) to place the specific name *diminuta* Rudolphi, 1819, as published in the binomen *Taenia diminuta* (specific name of type species of *Hymenolepis* Weinland, 1858) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the family-group name HYMENOLEPIDINAE Perrier, [1896] (type genus *Hymenolepis* Weinland, 1858) on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BURT, M. J. B. 1980 *in* ARAI, H. P. ed. *Biology of the tapeworm* Hymenolepis diminuta. Academic Press, 733 pp. (pp. 1–57).

RUDOLPHI, C. A. 1819. *Entozoorum Synopsis, cui accedunt mantissa duplex et indices locupletissimi*. Berlin, pp. x, 811 (p. 689).

STILES, C. W. 1896. Report on the present knowledge of the tapeworms of poultry. *Bull. Bur. Anim. Ind. U.S. Dept. Agric.*, no. 12, 73 pp., 20 pls.

WEINLAND D. F. 1858. *Human Cestoides. An essay on the tapeworms of Man.* Cambridge [Mass.], 93 pp.

ECHINOCOCCUS RUDOLPHI, 1801 (CESTODA): PROPOSED CONFIRMATION OF ENTRY ON THE OFFICIAL LIST.

Z.N.(S.)1157

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
(CIOMS Case No. 2)

The same reasons why the Commission should give urgent attention to the case of *Hymenolepis* Weinland, 1858 (see pp. 72–73) apply also to the case of *Echinococcus* Rudolphi, 1801: the entry in Opinion 84 placing this name on the Official List was found to be defective in 1958 (when the Name Number 283 was allotted to it); and the name figures in the CIOMS list of human parasitic diseases.

2. The full entry for *Echinococcus* in Opinion 84 reads as follows:

> '*Echinococcus* Rudolphi, 1801a, 52–53, type *granulosus* (in sheep; Europe).'

Echinococcus was described by Rudolphi, 1801, *Archiv Zool.* (Wiedemann), vol. 2(1), pp. 52–53 and 55 for the parasitic worms divided by Goeze into *Taenia visceralis, cerebrina, multiceps* and *Taenia visceralis socialis* granulosa. Neither of those specific names is available, since both are polynominal. Rudolphi did not designate a type species nor clearly indicate which of Goeze's species he regarded as valid. However, *'Taenia granulosa'* is always cited as the type species. It was first formally so designated by Stiles & Stevenson, 1905, *Bull. Bur. Anim. Ind. U.S. Dept. Agric.*, vol. 80, p. 13 as *'Taenia visceralis socialis granulosa'*. That designation under a polynominal name cannot be accepted as valid.

3. The specifc name *granulosa* was first made available, in the binomen *Hydatigena granulosa,* by Batsch, A. G. C., 1796, *Naturgeschichte der Bandwurmgattung* (Halle), pp. 87–88. By his synonymic reference to 'Götze, p. 258' he shows that he is referring to the nominal species described by Goeze, 1782, *Versuch Naturg. Eingeweidewürmer,* pp. 42, 192, 258. The species is cited as *'Echinococcus granulosus* (Batsch, 1786)' in two recent authoritative reference works: Yamaguti, 1959, *Systema Helminthum,* vol. 2, p. 442, and Wardle & Mcleod, 1952, *Zoology of Tapeworms,* p. 391.

4. *Echinococcus* Rudolphi, 1801 is clearly to be regarded as a genus established without any included species, since none were then cited under available names (Art. 69a(i)). The species (or one of those species) first subsequently referred to it must therefore be the type species. The first subsequent reference of species to the genus that I have traced is by Rudolphi himself. In 1805, *Bemerk. Gebiet Naturges., Med. Thierarzneyk. Reise Deutschland, Holland, Frankreich,* part 2, p. 41, he cited *'Echinococcus granulosus* mihi'. This is to be read as a citation of *Hydatigena granulosa* Batsch, 1786, which is in consequence the type species of *Echinococcus* by subsequent monotypy.

5. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(a) to confirm the entry of *Echinococcus* on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology and to complete it as follows: *Echinococcus* Rudolphi, 1801 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent monotypy, *Hydatigena granulosa* Batsch, 1786 (Name Number 283);

(b) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the specific name *granulosa* Batsch, 1786, as published in the binomen *Hydatigena granulosa* (specific name of type species of *Echinococcus* Rudolphi, 1801).

ANOPLOCEPHALA BLANCHARD, 1848 (CESTODA): PROPOSED CONFIRMATION OF ENTRY ON OFFICIAL LIST. Z.N.(S.)2498

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
(CIOMS Case No. 3)

The generic name *Anoplocephala* Blanchard, 1848 was placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology in Opinion 77 as follows:

> '*Anoplocephala* Blanchard, 1848e, 344–345; tsd *Taenia perfoliata* Goeze, 1782a, 43, 353 (type host *Equus caballus*; Europe). [HSW; S] [Not *Anoplocephala* Stal, 1870, hemipteron.]'

This is to be interpreted as follows: 'Blanchard, 1848e' refers to the comprehensive bibliography published by Stiles & Hassall, 1902, in the *Index Catalogue of Medical and Veterinary Zoology*; 'tsd' means type [species] by subsequent designation; 'HSW; S' means that the case had been studied by a committee of the Helminthological Society of Washington and by Stiles.

When the first instalments of the Official Lists were being prepared in 1958, the Name Number 242 was allotted to *Anoplocephala*; but the entry was not completed because the statement in Opinion 77 was found to be defective: Goeze, 1782 is not a binominal work, and consequently no name acquired availability by having been published in it. In addition, the ruling gives no indication of how, by whom or where the type species was designated.

2. *Anoplocephala*, like *Echinococcus* Rudolphi, 1801 (p. 74), must be considered to be a genus established without any included species (Article 69a(i)), since none was referred to it under an available name. The first subsequent reference of species to the genus that I have traced was by van Beneden, 1858, *Compte rendu Acad. Sci. Paris,* Suppl. vol. 2, p. 144, as follows: 'M. Blanchard a proposé le nom d'*anoplocephala* [sic] pour le Ténia de cheval et celui du lapin (*Tenia perfoliata* et *pectinata*) à cause de l'absence de trompe et de crochets'. This is to be read as a reference to the first use of those specific names as available names. For *perfoliata* this is Schrank, 1788, *Verz. der bisher hinlänglich bek. Eingeweidewürmer,* p. 37. What is to be read as *T. perfoliata* Schrank, 1788 was first subsequently designated as type species of *Anoplocephala* by Braun, 1900, Bronn's *Klassen und Ordnungen Tierr,* vol. 4, p. 1657.

3. Before these particulars can be incorporated in the Official List entry for *Anoplocephala,* and before *T. perfoliata* Schrank can be entered on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology, the status of *Taenia equina* Pallas, 1781 must be considered. Goeze's original name for *T. perfoliata*—*T. equina perfoliata*—could be taken for a normal trinomen, with *perfoliata* used with subspecific rank, were it not for the fact that the polynominal character of his work makes all names in it unavailable. *T. equina* Pallas, though senior to *T. perfoliata* Goeze, seems to have been treated as an

invalid synonym of it from an early date and then to have disappeared altogether from use as a valid name. I have examined the Supplements Part 3, Parasite-subject index, to the *Index Catalogue* from Supplement 15, 1966 to Supplement 23, 1982. I find 48 uses of *perfoliata* by a large number of authors; and no mention of *equina* in combination with either *Anoplocephala* or *Taenia*. Furthermore, Lichtenfels, 1975, *Proc. helminthol. Soc. Washington*, vol. 42, special issue, p. 9, lists '*T. equina* Pallas, 1781, part' in the synonymy of *A. perfoliata*, though no clear disposition is made of the remainder of the species. It seems certain that the name serves no useful purpose and that it can be suppressed without causing any disturbance to stability of nomenclature.

4. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *equina* Pallas, 1781, as published in the binomen *Taenia equina*, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

(2) to confirm the entry of *Anoplocephala* on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology and to complete it as follows: *Anoplocephala* Blanchard, 1848 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Braun, 1900, *Taenia perfoliata* Schrank, 1788 (Name Number 242);

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology *perfoliata* Schrank, 1788, as published in the binomen *Taenia perfoliata* (specific name of type species of *Anoplocephala* Blanchard, 1788);

(4) to place the generic name *Anoplocephala* Stål, 1870 (a junior homonym of *Anoplocephala* Blanchard, 1848) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology;

(5) to place the specific name *equina* Pallas, 1781, as published in the binomen *Taenia equina*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.

NOTE ADDED IN PROOF

I am grateful to Dr Ralph Lichtenfels (*Biosystematic Parasitology Laboratory USDA, Beltsville, Maryland U.S.A.*) for having 'checked the card files of the Index-Catalogue of Medical and Veterinary Zoology to determine whether any additional records of *Taenia equina* were known, especially between Stiles & Hassall's 1912 "Cestoda and Cestodaria" and the publication of the parasite-subject index which began in 1966'. There were only two such references and I have verified both of them, as follows:

(1) Becker, R., 29 Sept. 1923, Zur Nomenklatur der Pferdebandwürmer (Anoplocephalidae), *Centralbl. Bakteriol. etc.*, Abt. 1, Originale, vol. 91 (1), pp. 63–67. In this historical review, *Taenia equina* Pallas is referred to, but not as a valid name; *T. perfoliata* is recognised as valid.

(2) Sprehn, C. E. W. 1932, *Lehrb. Helminthol.*, pp. 407. 416. *Taenia equina* Pallas is divided into three parts: one is treated as an invalid synonym of *Anoplocephala perfoliata* (Goeze, 1782), the second as an invalid synonym of *A. magna* (Abildgaard, 1789), and the third as an invalid synonym of *Paranoplocephala mamillana* (Mehlis, 1831).

It is thus practically certain that *Taenia equina* Pallas has not been used as a valid name at least since 1912, and probably for very much longer.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary

HOMONYMY IN THE FAMILIES HARPIDAE HAWLE & CORDA, 1847 (TRILOBITA) AND HARPIDAE BRONN, 1849 (MOLLUSCA, GASTROPODA). Z.N.(S.)2331

By J. G. M. Raven (*Binnenweg 46, 2264 MK Leidschendam, The Netherlands*)

The problem of homonymy in the HARPIDAE was first raised as part of Z.N.(S.)1938, published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 28, pp. 57–58. In Opinion 1023 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 31, pp. 127–129, a ruling was made on part of the case but the HARPIDAE problem was deferred, pending further investigation. The present application seeks to resolve this issue.

2. Homonymy, as defined in Article 55 of the Code, exists between the family-group names HARPIDAE Hawle & Corda, 1847 (Trilobita) and HARPIDAE Bronn, 1849 (Mollusca, Gastropoda). Both family-group names are correctly derived as specified in Articles 11(e) and 29 of the Code, the former from the generic name *Harpes* Goldfuss, 1839 (p. 358) and the latter from the generic name *Harpa* [Röding], 1798 (p. 149).

3. In 1847 Hawle & Corda (p. 161) erected the trilobite family HARPIDES based on the genus *Harpes* Goldfuss, 1839. Miller, 1889 (p. 524) corrected the name to HARPIDAE.

4. In 1849 Bronn (p. 469) erected the gastropod family HARPINA based on the genus *Harpa* [Röding], 1798. Chenu, 1859 (p. 204) used the name HARPIDAE in the modern sense.

5. In accordance with Article 55(a) of the Code, I refer this case to the Commission. Although there are no formal grounds for preferring conservation of one family-group name over the other, in view of the following facts it is requested that the trilobite name be conserved; firstly that the trilobite family antedates that of the gastropods, and secondly, that the trilobite family contains more genera and species than the gastropod family, namely twelve genera (Moore, 1959) as against three (Rehder, 1973).

6. In altering the spelling of the gastropod family-group name, I believe the insertion of the letter ‘a’ preceding the ending ‘idae’ could be sufficiently distinct. Therefore I request that the gastropod family be emended as HARPAIDAE. The procedure of using the complete name has precedent in the case of *Merops* (Aves) and *Merope* (Insecta), where each resulted in the family name MEROPIDAE. To avoid homonymy, the Commission ruled that *Merope* (Insecta) should form the family name MEROPEIDAE (Opinion 140, 1943).

7. I therefore request that the Commission:

(1) use its plenary powers to rule that the stem of the generic name *Harpa* [Röding], 1798 (Gastropoda) for the purposes of Article 29 is HARPA-;

(2) place the following names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
  (a) *Harpes* Goldfuss, 1839 (Trilobita), (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Harpes macrocephalus* Goldfuss, 1839;
  (b) *Harpa* [Röding], 1798 (Gastropoda), (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Buccinum harpa* Linnaeus, 1758;

(3) place the following names on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology:
  (a) HARPIDAE Hawle & Corda, 1847 (type genus *Harpes* Goldfuss, 1839) (Trilobita);
  (b) HARPAIDAE Bronn, 1849 (type genus *Harpa* [Röding], 1798) (Gastropoda).

I wish to thank Professor L. B. Holthuis (Rijksmuseum voor Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden) for his considerable help in the preparation of this appeal.

REFERENCES

BRONN, H. G. 1849. *Handbuch der Geschichte der Natur, 3(3) Index Palaeontologicus.* Stuttgart, 980 pp.

CHENU, J. C. 1859. *Manuel de conchyliologie et de paléontologie conchyliologique,* vol. 1. Paris, vii + 508 pp., 3707 figs.

GOLDFUSS, G. A. 1839. Beiträge zur Petrefactenkunde. *Nova Acta Acad. Caes. Leop. Carol.,* vol. 19(1), pp. 358 & 359.

HAWLE, I. & CORDA, A. J. C. 1847. *Prodrom einer Monographie der Böhmischen Trilobiten.* K. Böhm. Gesell. Wiss. (Prague), (Abhandl.), 5, 176 pp., 7 pl.

LINNAEUS, C. 1758. *Systema Naturae* ed. 10, Holmiae, p. 738.

MILLER, S. A. 1889. *North American geology and paleontology.* 644 pp., 1194 figs.

MOORE, R. C. (Ed.) 1959. *Treatise on invertebrate paleontology, part O, Arthropoda 1.* Kansas University Press, xix + 560 pp.

REHDER, H. A. 1973. The Family Harpidae of the world. *Indo-Pacif. Mollusca,* vol. 3(16), pp. 207–274.

[RÖDING], P. F. 1798. *Museum Boltenianum* part 2, viii + 199 pp.

ARGYRODES SIMON, 1864, AND *ROBERTUS* O. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, 1879 (ARACHNIDA, ARANEAE): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *ARGYRODES* GUÉNÉE, 1845 AND *CTENIUM* MENGE, 1871. Z.N.(S.)1481

By Herbert W. Levi (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, U.S.A.*)

The purpose of the present request is for the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to permit the accustomed usage of two generic names of the spider family THERIDIIDAE: *Argyrodes* and *Robertus*. Present use of the names does not correspond with the strict application of the Rules.

2. A previous application (which included two lesser used generic names: *Dipoenura* and *Theonoe*) was published in 1962, *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 19(1), pp. 43–47. Because of accidental irregularities in procedure by the Secretary of the Commission at the time and despite considerable support, the voting paper issued in 1963 was cancelled. Under Article 80 the two names, *Argyrodes* and *Robertus*, have been protected since 1962.

Argyrodes Simon, 1864

3. *Argyrodes* Simon, 1864, *Hist. Nat. Araignées*, ed. 1, p. 253, with type species by tautonymy *Linyphia argyrodes* Walckenaer, 1841, *Hist. Ins. Apt.*, vol. 2, p. 282, from southern Europe and North Africa, is preoccupied by *Argyrodes* Guénée (1845, *Ann. Soc. entomol. France*, ser. 2, vol. 3, p. 322) (Lepidoptera) with type species by monotypy *Tinea vinetella* Fabricius, 1787.

4. Strand, 1928, *Arch. Naturgesch.*, vol. 93, p. 42, first noted the homonymy and proposed the name *Argyrodina* for *Argyrodes* Simon. In the 1940s *Conopistha* Karsch, 1881, *Berliner entomol. Zeitschr.*, vol. 25, p. 39, with type species by original designation *C. bonadea* Karsch, ibid., from Japan, was recognised as a subjective synonym of *Argyrodes* Simon. Between 1940 and 1962 *Conopistha* was generally used as the name for the genus. A revision of the American spiders of the genus by Exline & Levi, 1962, *Bull. Mus. comp. Zool.*, vol. 127, pp. 73–203, and a study of all theridiid genera by Levi, 1962, *Bull. Mus. comp. Zool.*, vol. 127, pp. 1–72 place both *Ariamnes* Thorell, 1869, *Nova Acta reg. Soc. Sci. Uppsala*, ser. 3, vol. 7, p. 37 (new name for *Ariadne* Doleschall, 1857, *Nat. Tijdschr. Nederland Ind.*, vol. 13, p. 410, preoccupied by two older homonyms, with type species by monotypy *A. flagellum* Doleschall) and *Rhomphaea* L. Koch, 1872, *Die Arachniden Australiens*, vol. 1, p. 289, with type species by monotypy *R. cometes* L. Koch, 1872, as additional subjective synonyms of *Argyrodes*, both antedating *Conopistha* Karsch, 1881. For the last 20 years most authors have used the name *Argyrodes*.

5. If we follow the Principle of Priority, the genus should be called *Ariamnes*, a name previously used for a small group of rare tropical spiders. However, those who disagree with the synonymy may still consider *Conopistha* or *Rhomphaea* the generic name. Others, like Bonnet, 1953 (*Bibliographia Araneorum*, vol. 2(1), p. 704) continue to consider *Argyrodes* as the correct name. Besides being the oldest name of this assemblage of species, *Argyrodes* is the type genus of a taxon in the family group. Simon, 1892, *Hist. Nat. Araignées*, vol. 1, p. 496, divided the THERIDIIDAE into groups, one of which he called ARGYRODEAE. Later authors (e.g. Petrunkevitch, 1928, *Trans. Connecticut Acad. Sci.*, vol. 29, p. 45) have interpreted ARGYRODEAE as a subfamily name, and have changed it to ARGYRODINAE. *Argyrodes* contains about 70 American species, and at least 100–200 species in the tropics and subtropics of other parts of the world.

6. According to Prof. W. T. Forbes and Dr E. G. Munroe (personal communication, 1961), *Argyrodes* Guénée (type species *Tinea vinetella* Fabricius) is a junior objective synonym of *Eucarphia* Hübner, [1825], *Verz. bekannt. Schmett.*, sign. 23, p. 364, which contains three species, with *Tinea vinetella* Fabricius, 1787 as type species, by subsequent designation by Ragonot, 1885, *Entom. mon. Mag.*, vol. 22, p. 18. *Argyrodes* Guénée cannot, therefore, be used for a lepidopteran genus as proposed by Guénée.

7. The genus *Argyrodes* contains many species which are klepto-parasites in the webs of other spiders, and whose interesting predatory behaviour has been studied by several zoologists in recent years.

8. The preservation of *Argyrodes* (spiders) through the suppression of *Argyrodes* (Lepidoptera) is thus advisable for 3 reasons:

(a) The continued widespread usage of *Argyrodes* in the aranean literature (e.g. Bonnet, 1955), owing to non-acceptance of the earlier senior homonym.
(b) The fact that the generic name is the basis of an available and currently used name of the family group.
(c) The uncertainty of what replacement name for *Argyrodes* (spiders) to adopt, owing to disagreement among specialists about the generic relation of the various generic names in the *Argyrodes* group.

All these difficulties would be removed at once if *Argyrodes* (Lepidoptera) were suppressed.

Robertus O. Pickard-Cambridge, 1879

9. B. J. Kaston, 1946, *Amer. Mus. Novitates*, No. 1306, p. 1, pointed out that Simon, 1884, *Arachnides de France*, vol. 5, p. 195 incorrectly rejected *Ctenium* Menge, 1871, *Schrift. naturf. Ges. Danzig* ser. 2, vol. 2, p. 292, type species, by monotypy, *Erigone pinguis* Westring, 1851, *Göteborg k. Vet. Vitter. Samh. Handl.*, vol. 2, p. 43 (= *Neriene livida* Blackwall, 1836), because he thought it preoccupied by *Ctenia* Lepeletier, 1825, *Encycl. Méth.*, vol. 10, p. 650. Simon proposed the name *Pedanostethus* (1884,

Arachnides de France, vol. 5, p. 195) as replacement for *Ctenium* Menge. However, *Robertus* O. Pickard-Cambridge, 1879, *The Spiders of Dorset*, p. 103, type species, by monotypy, *R. astutus* O. Pickard-Cambridge (= *Neriene neglecta* O. Pickard-Cambridge, 1871, *Trans. linn. Soc. London*, vol. 27, p. 443), was found to be a senior subjective synonym.

10. Between 1884 and 1911 *Pedanostethus* was generally used for the genus. From 1907 to the present time *Robertus* has been in use in Europe, and, until Kaston's 1946 paper, in North America.

11. At present *Robertus* is used. A. Holm, who has studied species of the genus, uses *Robertus*. The late H. Wiehle, a specialist in the THERIDIIDAE, published a short discussion on names indicating his preference for *Robertus* (1960, *Zool. Jahrbücher, Abt. Syst.*, vol. 88, p. 237). The name has also been used by Tullgren (1949, *Entomol. Tidskr.*, vol. 70, p. 60) and by G. H. Locket & A. F. Millidge (1953, *British Spiders, Ray Soc.*, vol. 2). In the United States *Ctenium* has been used in Kaston's revision of North American species (cited above) and in several regional lists. During the last 20 years the predominant use has been *Robertus*.

12. Universality of use demands that one or the other name be used for the genus. Usage strongly favours *Robertus*. It is therefore requested that the Commission use its plenary powers to suppress *Ctenium*.

(1) The International Commission is therefore asked to use its plenary powers:

(a) to suppress the generic name *Argyrodes* Guénée, 1845, and all uses of that name prior to the publication of *Argyrodes* Simon, 1864, for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy;

(b) to suppress the generic name *Ctenium* Menge, 1871, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority, but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The Commission is also asked to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:

(a) *Argyrodes* Simon, 1864 (gender: masculine), type species, by tautonymy, *Linyphia argyrodes* Walckenaer, 1841;

(b) *Robertus* O. Pickard-Cambridge, 1879 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Robertus astutus* Pickard-Cambridge, 1879;

(c) *Eucarphia* Hübner [1825], type species, by subsequent designation by Ragonot, 1855, *Tinea vinetella* Fabricius, 1787 (Lepidoptera).

(3) The Commission is requested to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *argyrodes* Walckenaer, 1841, as published in the binomen *Linyphia argyrodes* (specific name of type species of *Argyrodes* Simon, 1864);

(b) *neglectus* Pickard-Cambridge, 1871, as published in the binomen *Neriene neglecta* (the valid name at the date of this application, of the type species of *Robertus* O. Pickard-Cambridge, 1879);

(c) *vinetella* Fabricius, 1787, as published in the binomen *Tinea vinetella* (specific name of type species of *Eucarphia* Hübner, [1825]) (Lepidoptera).

(4) Finally, the Commission is asked to place the following generic names as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (a) and (b) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology:

(a) *Argyrodes* Guénée, 1845;

(b) *Ctenium* Menge, 1871.

OLPIUM L. KOCH, 1873 (ARACHNIDA, PSEUDOSCORPIONIDA, OLPIIDAE): PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES AND RELATED PROBLEMS. Z.N.(S.)2484

By M. S. Harvey (*Division of Entomology, CSIRO, GPO Box 1700, Canberra, A.C.T., Australia*) and V. Mahnert (*Muséum d'Histoire naturelle, Genève, Switzerland*)

The pseudoscorpion species described in the work *Description de l'Égypte ou recueil des observations et des recherches qui ont été faites en Égypte pendant l'expédition de l'armée française* have generally been ascribed to Savigny. However, while Savigny was responsible for publishing the first eight plates of the work some time prior to 1826 (possibly in 1812, see Sherborn, 1897), and was responsible for naming the species treated in the first four plates (Bonnet, 1945), there is no doubt that the name *Chelifer hermannii* (along with the other two species) was established, in the meaning of Article 50 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, by Audouin in 1826. *Chelifer hermannii* Audouin, 1826, is a junior homonym of *Chelifer hermanni* Leach, 1817, and Simon (1879) provided the replacement name *Olpium savignyi* Simon, 1879.

2. L. Koch (1873) erected the genus *Olpium,* with four included species, *Olpium dimidiatum* L. Koch, 1873, *Olpium chironomum* L. Koch, 1873, *Olpium graecum* L. Koch, 1873, and '*Olpium Hermannii* Sav.' (i.e. *Chelifer hermannii* Audouin, 1826), but did not designate a type species. Simon (1879) by subsequent designation fixed *Chelifer hermanni* Savigny *sensu* L. Koch as the type species of *Olpium* L. Koch, 1873, noting that Koch's description of that species did not agree with Savigny's (i.e. Audouin's). At the same time he suggested that this species could be identified as *Obisium pallipes* Lucas, 1849. That view also has been generally accepted, and *Obisium pallipes* Lucas, 1849 has been consistently treated as the type species of *Olpium* L. Koch, 1873. *Olpium pallipes* Lucas, [1846] has been mentioned in the literature many times, and is widely distributed in southern Europe and northern Africa (Beier, 1963). Its female holotype has recently been redescribed by Heurtault (1979).

3. The problem of the type species of *Olpium* L. Koch, 1873, is not resolved automatically by the International Code on Zoological Nomenclature. Article 69 does not apply to the case because even though the nominal taxon *Chelifer hermannii* Audouin, 1826, was originally included in *Olpium* by Koch, it was a misidentification, but not a *stated* misidentification. *Chelifer hermannii* Audouin *sensu* L. Koch, 1873, and *Obisium pallipes* Lucas, [1846], are not originally included species in terms of Article 69. Article 70a does not strictly apply either because the type species was designated explicitly in the sense of a previous misidentification. Similarly Article 70b is not applicable because *Chelifer hermannii* Audouin, 1826,

was not designated the type species of a new nominal genus, but of a pre-established nominal genus. Therefore, the Commission is requested to use its plenary powers to designate *Obisium pallipes* Lucas, [1846] as the type species of *Olpium* L. Koch, 1873.

4. Two other options are available, both of which have considerable disadvantages: (a) to designate the nominal species *Chelifer hermannii* Audouin, 1826, as type species — this is undesirable because *Chelifer hermannii* Audouin, 1826, is regarded as a *nomen dubium* (see (5) below); or (b) to set aside under the plenary powers Simon's (1879) designation of *Olpium hermanni* 'Savigny' *sensu* L. Koch, and to designate one of the other three species originally included in the genus *Olpium* L. Koch, 1873 — these three taxa have since been removed from the genus, and if this course were followed, stability would not be well served, because *Olpium* L. Koch, 1873, is the type species of the family OLPIIDAE Banks, 1895.

5. The type material of *Chelifer hermannii* Audouin, 1826, is not present in the Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris, and is considered lost. The diagrams presented with the original description (Plate 8, Fig. 5) clearly show that the species belongs in the genus *Minniza* Simon, 1881, but they are not sufficiently detailed to determine its specific identity, and four species of *Minniza* Simon, 1881, are currently known from Egypt. Thus, *Chelifer hermannii* Audouin, 1826, and its replacement name, *Olpium savignyi* Simon, 1879, are regarded as nomina dubia.

6. Simon (1881) described *Olpium kochi* Simon, 1881, and cited '*Chelifer Hermanni* Sav., Égypte, Ar., pl. VIII, f. 5, 1827' under the species name, thus giving the appearance that it was offered as another replacement name for *Chelifer hermannii* Audouin, 1826. Indeed, at the end of the description he stated 'Le nom d'*Hermanni* ne peut être maintenu, ayant été employé par Savigny par confusion avec le *C. Hermanni* de Leach, qui est synonyme de *C. cancroides* L.' If this interpretation is accepted *Olpium kochi* Simon, 1881, becomes a junior objective synonym of *Olpium savignyi* Simon, 1879. However, the specimens on which Simon (1881) based his description of *Olpium kochi* Simon, 1881 (lodged in the Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris, and examined by V.M.) do not conform to the original description or diagrams of *Chelifer hermannii* Audouin, 1826. They represent a distinct species of the genus *Olpium* L. Koch, 1873, and were recently redescribed by Mahnert (1981). If *Olpium kochi* Simon, 1881, can be treated as a new species separate from *Chelifer hermannii* Audouin, 1826 (even though Simon wrote '*Olpium kochi* E. Simon' rather than his customary 'n.sp.'), the specimens in Paris can be treated as its type material, as was done by Mahnert (1981). We consider that this is desirable and therefore ask the Commission to rule that *Olpium kochi* Simon, 1881 denotes a different nominal species from *Chelifer hermannii* Audouin, 1826. A lectotype male for *Olpium kochi* Simon, 1881, is here designated from 'nord de la grande Pyramide', Egypt, collected by A. Letourneux, and deposited in the Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris (Simon collection number 3329, preparation number 84–86). The female is designated as a paralec-

totype. If this course is not followed, *Olpium kochi* Simon, 1881, remains a junior objective synonym of *Olpium savignyi* Simon, 1879, and a new species name needs to be created for this material.

7. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is hereby requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers
  (a) to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Olpium* Koch, 1873 and to designate *Obisium pallipes* Lucas, 1849 as type species of that genus;
  (b) to rule that the specific name *kochi* Simon, 1881, as published in the binomen *Olpium kochi,* denotes a different nominal species from *hermannii* Audouin, 1826, as published in the binomen *Chelifer hermannii;*
(2) to place the generic name *Olpium* L. Koch, 1873 (gender: neuter), on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology, with the type species, as designated in (1) above, *Obisium pallipes* Lucas, 1849;
(3) to place the specific name *pallipes* Lucas [1846], as published in the combination *Obisium pallipes,* (specific name of type species of *Olpium* L. Koch, 1873) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;
(4) to place the specific name *kochi* Simon, 1881, as published in the combination *Olpium kochi* Simon, 1881, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;
(5) to place the family-group name OLPIIDAE Banks, 1895 (type genus, *Olpium* L. Koch, 1873) on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

AUDOUIN, V. 1826. Explication sommaire des planches d'arachnides de l'Égypte et de la Syrie. In *Description de l'Égypte ou recueil des observations et des recherches qui ont été faites en Égypte pendant l'expédition de l'armée française*. 1st edition. Vol. 1, part 4, Paris (C. L. F. Panckoucke), pp. 99–186.

BANKS, N. 1985. Notes on the Pseudoscorpionida. *J. N.Y. entomol. Soc.*, vol. 3, pp. 1–13.

BEIER, M. 1963. Ordnung Pseudoscorpionidea. *Bestimmungsbücher zur Bodenfauna Europas*. Berlin (Akademie-Verlag), vol. 1, pp. i–vi, 1–313.

BONNET, P. 1945. *Bibliographia araneorum*. Vol. 1, Toulouse (Douladoure), pp. i–xvii, 1–832.

HEURTAULT, J. 1979. Complément à la description de *Olpium pallipes* Lucas, 1845, type de la famille Olpiidae (Arachnides, Pseudoscorpions). *Rev. suisse Zool.*, vol. 86, pp. 925–931.

KOCH, L. 1873. *Uebersichtliche Darstellung der europäischen Chernetiden (Pseudoscorpione)*. Nürnberg (Bauer and Raspe), pp. i–vi, 1–68.

LEACH, W. E. 1817. On the characters of the genera of the family Scorpionidea, with descriptions of the British species of *Chelifer* and *Obisium*. In LEACH, W. E. *The zoological miscellany; being descriptions of new or interesting animals*. London (Nodder), pp. 48–53.

LUCAS, H. 1849. Histoire naturelle des animaux articulés. Part I. Crustacés, Arachnides, Myriapodes et Hexapodes. In *Exploration scientifique de l'Algérie pendant les années 1840, 1841, 1842*. Zoologie, Vol. 2, Paris (Imprimerie Nationale), pp. i–xxv, 1–403.

MAHNERT, V. 1981. Taxonomische Irrwege: *Olpium savignyi* Simon, *O. kochi* Simon, *O. bicolor* Simon (Pseudoscorpiones). *Folia entomol. Hung.*, vol. 42, pp. 95–99.

SHERBORN, C. D. 1897. On the dates of the Natural History portion of Savigny's 'Description de l'Égypte'. *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.*, vol. 1897, pp. 285–288.

SIMON, E. 1879. *Les arachnides de France*. Vol. 7, Paris (Librairie Encyclopédique de Roret), pp. 1–316.

———1881. Descriptions d'arachnides nouveaux d'Afrique. *Bull. Soc. zool. France*, vol. 6, pp. 1–15.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This application has benefited immensely from the nomenclatural expertise of Dr K. H. L. Key (CSIRO, Canberra). Dr W. D. L. Ride kindly viewed a draft of the manuscript. Dr A. D. Austin and Mr R. V. Melville assisted with some of the older literature.

ICHNOTROPIS PETERS, 1854 (REPTILIA, SAURIA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *THERMOPHILUS* FITZINGER, 1843. Z.N.(S.)2377

By William R. Branch (*Port Elizabeth Museum, P.O. Box 13147, Humewood 6013, South Africa*) and Donald G. Broadley (*National Museum, P.O. Box 240, Bulawayo, Zimbabwe*)

The purpose of this application is to suppress a generic name not used in the literature during the last hundred years and which is a senior synonym of *Ichnotropis* Peters, 1854.

2. In 1843 Fitzinger erected the genus *Thermophilus*, designating *Tropidosaura capensis* 'Duméril & Bibron' (i.e. *Algyra capensis* A. Smith, 1838) as the type species (*Syst. Rept.*, p. 21).

3. In 1854 Peters erected the genus *Ichnotropis* (*Mber. Acad. Wiss. Berl.*, p. 617), of which the type species by subsequent designation by FitzSimons, 1943, p. 349, is *I. macrolepidota* Peters, 1854 (= *Algyra capensis* A. Smith).

4. In 1921 Boulenger (*Monograph of the Lacertidae*, vol. 2, pp. 179–193) cited the use of *Ichnotropis* Peters by 12 authors in 17 papers, but overlooked the name *Thermophilus* Fitzinger.

5. In 1957 Loveridge pointed out that the name *Thermophilus* Fitzinger had priority over *Ichnotropis* Peters and urged that the Commission be requested to set aside the older name (*Bull. Mus. comp. Zool. Harv.*, vol. 117, pp. 149, 233).

6. Since 1921, the name *Ichnotropis* Peters has been used in at least 35 papers by 16 authors. In accordance with Article 79(b) of the Code, approved by the XVII Congress in 1972, the following is a selection of 'at least 5 different authors and in at least 10 different publications' in which *Ichnotropis* Peters has been used during the last 50 years:

Cott, H. B. 1934, *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.*, 1934, vol. 1, pp. 145–173.
FitzSimons, V. F. 1943. *The Lizards of South Africa. Transvaal Mus. Mem.*, vol. 1, xv + 528 pp.
Witte, G. F. de & Laurent, R. F. 1942. *Rev. Zool. Bot. Africa*, vol. 36(2), pp. 165–180.
Loveridge, A. 1953. *Bull. Mus. comp. Zool. Harv.*, vol. 110(3), pp. 143–322.
Mertens, R. 1955. *Abh. senkenb. naturforsch. Ges.*, vol. 490, pp. 1–172.
Marx, H. 1956. *Fieldiana Zool.*, vol. 39, pp. 5–9.
Laurent, R. F. 1964. *Publçöes cult. Co. Diam. Angola*, vol. 67, pp. 1–165.
Broadley, D. G. 1967. *Arnoldia Rhodesia*, vol. 3(24), pp. 1–5.
Pianka, E. R. 1971. *Ecol.*, vol. 52(6), pp. 1024–1029.
Broadley, D. G. 1971. *Puku*. No. 6, pp. 1–143.

7. Since its establishment, the generic name *Thermophilus* Fitzinger has not been formally used again.

8. In the interests of nomenclatural stability the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Thermophilus* Fitzinger, 1843, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

(2) to place the generic name *Ichnotropis* Peters, 1854 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by FitzSimons, 1943, *macrolepidota* Peters, 1854, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *capensis* A. Smith, 1838, as published in the binomen *Algyra capensis* (the valid name at the date of this request of the type species of *Ichnotropis* Peters, 1854) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the generic name *Thermophilus* Fitzinger, 1843, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology.

ERIGONE AUDOUIN, 1826 (ARTHROPODA, ARANEAE): PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES. Z.N.(S.)2480

By A. F. Millidge (*Little Farthing, Upper Westhill Road, Lyme Regis, Dorset DT7 3ER, England)*

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to set aside *Erigone vagans* Audouin, 1826 (*fide* Sherborn, 1897, *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.*, pp. 285–288) as the type species of the genus *Erigone* Audouin, 1826 and to designate as the type species *Erigone longipalpis* Sundevall, 1830.

2. *Erigone* is a large and well-known spider genus. As currently constituted, more than 200 species are listed for this genus in the published catalogues (*vide* C. F. Roewer, 1942, *Katalog der Araneae,* vol. 1, pp. 719–728; P. Bonnet, 1956 *Bibliographia Araneorum,* vol. 2(2), pp. 1740–1780; P. Brignoli, 1983, *Catalogue of the Araneae described between 1940 and 1981*, pp. 336–337). The genus is widely distributed, and there are few areas in the world where *Erigone* species are not present.

3. The type species of *Erigone* Audouin, 1826 (*Description de l'Egypte: Histoire Naturelle,* vol. 1(4), p. 115) is *Erigone vagans* Audouin, 1826 (*ibid.*, p. 116) by monotypy. Comparison of the genitalia of *Erigone vagans* with those of other *Erigone* species, however, indicates (A. F. Millidge, 1984, *Bull. Br. arachnol. Soc.*, vol. 6(6), p. 265) that *E. vagans* is not congeneric with the vast majority of the species which have been assigned to *Erigone; E. vagans* does not, in fact, have the female epigynum and the male palpal organ of the well-known and easily recognisable '*Erigone* type'.

4. This situation will necessitate the transfer of approximately 150 species from *Erigone* to a new genus; this estimate takes into account that some *Erigone* species listed in the catalogues quoted above have subsequently been moved to other genera. Many of the species to be transferred to a new genus are common and widespread, and have been known in the literature as *Erigone* species for 50–150 years; a change in the generic name would consequently produce a good deal of undesirable confusion in the arachnological literature.

5. In order to preserve the name *Erigone* for the many species which (i) have always been known by this name, and (ii) have the characteristic genitalia associated with the name *Erigone,* it is requested that the designation of *Erigone vagans* as the type species of the genus *Erigone* be set aside and *Erigone longipalpis* Sundevall, 1830 (*K. Svenska Vetensk. Akad. Handl.*, 1829, p. 212) be designated instead as the type species. This latter species, which was the second to be described under the name *Erigone*, has the female epigynum and the male palpal organ of the typical '*Erigone*' form, and has been well described in the literature (e.g. W. Kulczynski, 1902, *Bull. Acad. Cracovie,* 1902(8), p. 541; G. H. Locket & A. F. Millidge, 1953,

British Spiders, vol. 2, p. 311; H. Wiehle, 1960, *Tierwelt Deutschlands*, vol. 47, p. 576).

6. If it is agreed that the Commission should take the action requested, then it will subsequently become necessary to place *vagans* in a new genus. Apart from *vagans*, the species to be transferred from *Erigone* to this new genus would be few in number and of limited distribution (e.g. *Erigone afroalpina* Holm, 1962, *Zool. Bidr. Upps.*, vol. 35, p. 73), and these few name changes would cause only a minor ripple in nomenclatural stability.

7. In summary the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is requested to:

(1) use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Erigone* Audouin, 1826, and to designate *Erigone longipalpis* Sundevall, 1830 as the type species of that genus;

(2) place the generic name *Erigone* Audouin, 1826 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Erigone longipalpis* Sundevall, 1830, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) place the specific name *longipalpis* Sundevall, 1830 (specific name of the type species of *Erigone* Audouin, 1826) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

ACTIA ROBINEAU-DESVOIDY, 1830 (INSECTA, DIPTERA): REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES. Z.N.(S.)2491

By James E. O'Hara (*Department of Entomology, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2E3*)

Actia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, is a cosmopolitan genus belonging to the SIPHONINI with about 60 described species. The only valid type species designation for *Actia* makes it a senior objective synonym of *Elfia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1850. Current authors do not accept this type species designation because it was based upon a misconception of the species involved, and they continue to regard *Elfia* as a valid genus of moderate size in the NEAERINI (a tribe whose affinities to the SIPHONINI are unresolved). The unofficially accepted type species of *Actia, A. pilipennis* R.-D., 1830, is a junior secondary homonym of *Tachina pilipennis* Fallén, 1810; a valid *Actia* species. *Roeselia lamia* Meigen, 1838, has been recognised as a junior subjective synonym of *A. pilipennis* R.-D. since Robineau-Desvoidy's second treatment of *Actia* in 1850, and has been used as a replacement name for *A. pilipennis* R.-D. since at least the 1920s. This junior subjective synonym, *A. lamia* (Mg.), has no type, but syntypes survive of the junior secondary homonym, *A. pilipennis* R.-D. To fix the synonymy of *A. pilipennis* R.-D. and *A. lamia* (Mg.), a syntype of the former is designated below as lectotype of that species and neotype of *A. lamia*. The Commission is requested to suppress all type designations hitherto made for *Actia* R.-D. and to use its plenary powers to designate *Roeselia lamia* Mg. as type species, to preserve *Actia* and *Elfia* in their accepted usage. Details of the application follow.

2. In 1830 Robineau-Desvoidy described the new genus *Actia* and included in it new species *A. pilipennis* and *A. cingulata* (1830, pp. 85–86). Subsequently Robineau-Desvoidy removed *cingulata* and placed it in his new genus *Elfia* along with one new species (1850, pp. 190–191). A year later Robineau-Desvoidy revised *Actia* and added one new species to the already included *pilipennis* (1851, pp. 185–187). In his final (and posthumous) work Robineau-Desvoidy retained *Actia* and *Elfia* in the senses established in his 1850 and 1851 publications, and designated *cingulata* R.-D., 1830, as type species for the latter (1863, p. 672). Unfortunately, he did not similarly designate a type species for *Actia*.

3. Most authors of the late 1800s and early 1900s followed Robineau-Desvoidy's concept of *Actia*, but were uncertain about the identity and placement of *E. cingulata* (R.-D.). For example, *Elfia* was placed as a synonym of *Actia* in the catalogue by Bezzi & Stein (1907), with *cingulata* R.-D. questionably placed as a synonym of *Actia frontalis* (Macquart). (Bezzi & Stein did not explain why they replaced *pilipennis* R.-D. with *frontalis* Macq., 1845, rather than with the more senior synonym, *lamia* Mg., 1838. Later *lamia* Mg. became entrenched in the literature as the recognised replacement name for *pilipennis* R.-D.). Coquillett (1910, p. 503) may have relied upon Bezzi & Stein's catalogue when he mistakenly considered

cingulata R.-D. and *pilipennis* R.-D. synonyms and designated *cingulata* R.-D. as type species of *Actia*. In so doing Coquillett fixed *Elfia* as junior objective synonym of *Actia*.

4. Coquillett's type species designation in 1910 went unchallenged for many years because *cingulata* R.-D. was generally unrecognised. Mesnil (1954) attributes Stein (1924, p. 141) with first recognising the true identity of *cingulata* R.-D., though Stein's recognition was overlooked by many of his contemporaries. When the identity of *cingulata* R.-D. was eventually established, it became apparent that the species did not conform to the genus based upon *pilipennis* R.-D., as indeed recognised earlier by Robineau-Desvoidy in his works subsequent to 1830. Only two major revisionary works to my knowledge accepted Coquillett's type species designation once the distinction between *pilipennis* R.-D. and *cingulata* R.-D. became clear. These were Townsend's *Manual of Myiology* (1940, p. 189) and Mesnil's revision of African *Actia* and allies (1954). In the latter, Mesnil (1954, p. 5) followed Coquillett's designation in part because he misunderstood Robineau-Desvoidy's own explanation (1863, p. 672) about the tribal placements of *Actia* and *Elfia* (but see Mesnil's subsequent position in paragraph 7 below).

5. Rondani first treated the genus *Actia* briefly in 1856, keying the genus and adding below the generic epithet, '*Spec. Typ:* (Nova) Vitripennis Mihi' (1856, p. 60). A few years later Rondani (1859, pp. 18–19) fully described *Actia vitripennis,* clearly using the name as a replacement name for *Actia pilipennis* R.-D. because the latter is a junior secondary homonym of *A. pilipennis* (Fallén). Bezzi (1926, p. 238) considered the two publications by Rondani sufficient to fix *pilipennis* R.-D. as type species of *Actia,* and concluded that Coquillett's designation of *cingulata* was in error. Herting (1974, p. 19) similarly regarded Rondani's type designation as valid, even though he recognised that in 1856 *vitripennis* was a *nomen nudum* and that the name was not validated until Rondani's description of the species in 1859.

6. Contrary to the opinions of Bezzi and Herting in paragraph 5 above, Rondani's 1856 type designation cannot be accepted because it does not fulfill the necessary requirements of the Code. If Rondani had simultaneously described *vitripennis* as a replacement name for *pilipennis* R.-D. and designated it type species of *Actia,* then under Article 69a(iv) *pilipennis* R.-D. would automatically become the type species of *Actia*. Since Rondani's type designation was in 1856 and his species description in 1859, his designation is invalid.

7. At least two authors (Mesnil, 1963, p. 814 and van Emden, 1954, p. 63) have argued that *Actia* became monotypic when *cingulata* R.-D. was removed from it by Robineau-Desvoidy in 1850, and concluded that *pilipennis* R.-D. was fixed as type species of *Actia* from that time forth. However, there is no provision under the Code for acceptance of a type species designation by subsequent elimination of included species, so this interpretation by these authors must be rejected.

8. Despite attempts like those above to lend credence to the use of *pilipennis* R.-D. as type species of *Actia*, the evidence presented here indicates that the only valid type species designation was that of *cingulata* R.-D. by Coquillett in 1910. It is therefore necessary to suppress Coquillett's type species designation in order to preserve both *Actia* and *Elfia* in their current usage. That this interpretation is favoured by the majority of specialists is evident from the following list of recent works which employ both *Actia* and *Elfia* in the sense of Robineau-Desvoidy, and whose authors explicitly state that suspension of the I.C.Z.N. rules is required to validate this usage: Sabrosky & Arnaud (1965, p. 1061), Guimarães (1971, p. 164), Crosskey (1973, p. 136; 1976, p. 211; 1980, p. 852) and Andersen (1983, p. 12). Those who favour this interpretation also recognise *A. pilipennis* R.-D. as a junior secondary homonym of *A. pilipennis* (Fallén), and replace the name with *A. lamia* (Mg.). The type of *lamia* is lost, so its synonymy with *pilipennis* R.-D. is disputable unless action is taken to preserve it permanently. Below *pilipennis* R.-D. and *lamia* Mg. are made objective synonyms by designation of a neotype for *lamia* Mg. from among the syntypes of Robineau-Desvoidy's *A. pilipennis*. To further stabilize this synonymy, the specimen chosen as neotype of *lamia* Mg. is also designated lectotype of *A. pilipennis* R.-D. The Commission is requested to designate *Roeselia lamia* Meigen as type species of *Actia* rather than *Actia pilipennis* R.-D. to avoid possible confusion of the latter name with its senior homonym, *A. pilipennis* (Fallén).

9. If the Commission rules against this proposal, then the genus *Elfia* must be called *Actia*, and the old *Actia* must be renamed. Besides the nomenclatural objections to this raised above, one must also consider the effects a reapplication of the name *Actia* would have on host/parasite records. Published records would probably be frequently misinterpreted, and undated parasite records existing in collections or on unpublished lists as '*Actia* sp.' would become equivocal.

10. The syntype series of *Actia pilipennis* R.-D. is composed of 6 specimens: 5 males and 1 specimen lacking head and abdomen. They have been examined and one specimen has been chosen to serve as lectotype of *pilipennis* R.-D. and neotype of *lamia* Mg. The following information about the specimen is provided to satisfy the conditions of lectotype and neotype designations outlined in Articles 74 and 75 respectively: Male, length 4·4 mm, good condition though slightly mouldy, without labels (type-locality published as Saint-Sauveur, France), deposited in the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle (Paris). The specimen is consistent with the original descriptions of *Actia pilipennis* R.-D. (1830, p. 86) and *Roeselia lamia* Meigen (1838, p. 254). A label bearing the following information has been attached to this specimen: 'Lectotype of *Actia pilipennis* R.-D., Neotype of *Roeselia lamia* Mg., O'Hara designation, Selected 1984'. The species, under the name *Actia lamia*, is keyed and fully described by Mesnil (1963, pp. 814, 820).

11. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Actia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, and having done so to designate *Roeselia lamia* Meigen, 1838, as type species of that genus;

(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   - (a) the generic name *Actia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (gender: feminine), type species *Roeselia lamia* Meigen, 1838, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above;
   - (b) the generic name *Elfia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (gender: feminine), type species *Actia cingulata* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, by designation of Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863, thereby removing *Elfia* from objective synonymy with *Actia* under the plenary powers of (1) above; and

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   - (a) the species name *lamia* Meigen, 1838, as published in the binomen *Roeselia lamia* (specific name of type species of *Actia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830) and as defined by the neotype designated above;
   - (b) the species name *cingulata* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, as published in the binomen *Actia cingulata* (specific name of type species of *Elfia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1850).

Special thanks are extended to Dr Curtis W. Sabrosky for his valuable advice concerning an early draft of this proposal.

REFERENCES

ANDERSEN, S. 1983 Phylogeny and classification of Old World genera of Siphonini (Diptera: Tachinidae). *Entomol. scand.*, vol. 14, pp. 1–15.

BEZZI, M. 1926. A new tachinid (Dipt.) from Australia, with notes on the forms with obliterated fourth vein. *Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.*, series 9, vol. 17, pp. 236–241.

BEZZI, M. & STEIN, P. 1907. Band III. Cyclorrapha Aschiza. Cyclorrapha Schizophora: Schizometopa. In BECKER, T., BEZZI, M., KERTÉSZ, K. and STEIN, P. *Katalog der paläarktischen Dipteren*. 828 pp. Budapest.

COQUILLETT, D. W. 1910. The type-species of the North American genera of Diptera. *Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus.*, vol. 37, pp. 499–647.

CROSSKEY, R. W. 1973. A conspectus of the Tachinidae (Diptera) of Australia, including keys to the supraspecific taxa and taxonomic and host catalogues. *Bull. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.), Entomol. Suppl.*, vol. 21, 221 pp.

———1976. A taxonomic conspectus of the Tachinidae (Diptera) of the Oriental Region. *Bull. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.), Entomol. Suppl.*, vol. 26, 357 pp.

———1980. 93. Family Tachinidae. Pp. 822–882. In CROSSKEY, R. W., ed., *Catalogue of the Diptera of the Afrotropical region*. 1437 pp. London.

EMDEN, F. I. VAN 1954. Diptera Cyclorrhapha. Calyptrata (1) Section (a). Tachinidae and Calliphoridae. *Roy. entomol. Soc. Lond., Handb. Ident. brit. Ins.*, vol. 10, part 4(a), 133 pp.

FALLÉN, C. F. 1810. Försök att bestämma de i Sverige funne flugarter, som kunna föras till slägtet *Tachina*. *K. Vetensk. Acad. Nya Handl.*, series 2, vol. 31, pp. 253–287.

GUIMARÃES, J. H. 1971. 104 Family Tachinidae (Larvaevoridae). In *A catalogue of the Diptera of the Americas south of the United States*. 333 pp. São Paulo.

HERTING, B. 1969. Notes on European Tachinidae (Dipt.) described by Rondani (1856–1868). *Mem. Soc. entomol. ital.*, vol. 48, pp. 189–204.

———1974. Revision der von Robineau-Desvoidy beschriebenen europäischen Tachiniden und Rhinophorinen (Diptera). *Stuttgart. Beitr. Naturk.*, series A, no. 264, 46 pp.

———1975. Nachtrage und Korrekturen zu den von Meigen und Rondani beschriebenen Raupenfliegen (Dipt. Tachinidae). *Stuttgart. Beitr. Naturk.*, series A, no. 271, 13 pp.

MACQUART, J. 1845. Nouvelles observations sur les insectes Diptères de la tribu des Tachinaires. *Ann. Soc. entomol. France*, series 2, vol. 3, pp. 237–296.

MEIGEN, J. W. 1838. Systematische Beschreibung der bekannten europäischen zweiflügeligen Insekten. Vol. 7: 'oder Supplementband', xii + 434 pp. Hamm.

MESNIL, L. P. 1954. Genres *Actia* Robineau-Desvoidy et voisins (Diptera Brachycera Calyptratae). *Explor. Parc natn. Albert, Miss G. F. de Witte (1933–1935)*, vol. 81, 41 pp.

———1963. 64g. Larvaevorinae (Tachininae). Pp. 801–848. In LINDNER, E., ed., *Die Fliegen der palaearktischen Region*, vol. 8. Stuttgart.

ROBINEAU-DESVOIDY, J. B. 1830. Essai sur les Myodaires. *Inst. de France, Sci. Math. et Phys., Acad. Roy. des Sci., Mém. présentés par divers Savans*, series 2, vol. 2, 813 pp. Paris.

———1850. Myodaires des environs de Paris (suite). *Ann. Soc. entomol. France*, series 2, vol. 8, pp. 183–209.

———1851. Myodaires des environs de Paris (suite). *Ann. Soc. entomol. France*, series 2, vol. 9, pp. 177–190.

———1863. *Histoire naturelle des Diptères des environs de Paris*. Vol. 1, xvi + 1143 pp. Paris.

RONDANI, C. 1856. *Dipterologiae Italicae prodromus*. Vol. 1. *Genera Italica ordinis dipterorum ordinatim disposita et distincta et in familias et stirpes aggregata*. 228 pp. Parma.

———1859. *Dipterologiae Italicae prodromus*. Vol. 3. *Species Italicae ordinis dipterorum in genera characteribus definita, ordinatim collectae, methodo analitica distinctae, et novis vel minus cognitis descriptis. Pars secunda: Muscidae, Siphoninae et (partim) Tachininae*. 243 pp. Parma.

STEIN, P. 1924. Die verbreitetsten Tachiniden Mitteleuropas nach ihren Gattungen und Arten. *Arch. Naturgesch.*, series A, vol. 90(6), pp. 1–271.

TOWNSEND, C. H. T. 1940. *Manual of myiology in twelve parts*. Part 10: *Oestroid generic diagnoses and data (Anacamptomyiini to Frontinini)*. 335 pp. São Paulo.

Carpophaga aurorae Peale, 1848 and *Serresius galeatus* Bonaparte (Aves). M. D. Bruce, D. T. Holyoak & J.-C. Thibault 50
Humerobates Sellnick, 1928 (Arachnida, Acari). R. A. Norton 54
Hatschekia Poche, 1902 (Crustacea, Copepoda). J. B. Jones 57
Description of new taxa based on enzyme data. J. E. Jelnes; R. Fortuner. 60
Authorship and dates of the Sowerbys' Mineral Conchology of Great Britain. C. W. Wright & R. J. Cleevely 64
Hymenolepis Weinland, 1858 (Cestoda). The Secretary 72
Echinococcus Rudolphi, 1801 (Cestoda). The Secretary 74
Anoplocephala Blanchard, 1848 (Cestoda) The Secretary 76
Homonymy in the families HARPIDAE Hawle & Corda, 1847 (Trilobita) and HARPIDAE Bronn, 1849 (Mollusca, Gastropoda). J. G. M. Raven 79
Argyrodes Simon, 1864 and *Robertus* O. Pickard-Cambridge, 1879 (Arachnida, Araneae). H. W. Levi 81
Olpium L. Koch, 1873 (Arachnida, Pseudoscorpionida, Olpiidae). M. S. Harvey & V. Mahnert 85
Ichnotropis Peters, 1854 (Reptilia, Sauria). W. R. Branch & D. G. Broadley 89
Erigone Audouin, 1826 (Arthropoda, Araneae). A. F. Millidge 91
Actia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Insecta, Diptera). J. E. O'Hara . . . 93

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature wishes to express its appreciation of the facilities provided by the Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History) for the Secretariat of the Commission.

CONTENTS

Page
Officers and Members of the Commission i
Members of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature . . . ii
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology 1
Special Announcements 3

Comments

Hyla lactea Daudin, 1803 (Amphibia). A. F. Stimson 6
Nymphula Schrank, 1802 (Insecta, Lepidoptera), W. Speidel. 7
Laspeyresia Hübner, [1825] (Insecta, Lepidoptera). R. W. Hodges; W. E. Miller; J. D. Bradley, W. G. Tremewan, K. Tuck & C. J. Hamilton. 8
Zygaena anthyllidis Boisduval, 1828 (Insecta, Lepidoptera). Secretary . 10
On the proposed amendment to Article 51c of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. J. C. Cokendolpher, O. F. Francke & D. Quintero Jn.. 10
On the proposed amendment to Article 70b of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. C. W. Wright 12
Bagrus Bosc, 1816 (Pisces, Siluriformes). W. R. Taylor 14

Opinions

Opinion 1288. *Sphinx tipuliformis* Clerck, 1759 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) . 17
Opinion 1289. *Mesoplodon* Gervais, 1850 (Mammalia, Cetacea) . . . 19
Opinion 1290. *Leptinotarsa* Chevrolat, 1837 (Insecta, Coleoptera). . . 21
Opinion 1291. *Antilope zebra* Gray, 1838 (Mammalia) 24
Opinion 1292. *Voluta papilio* Link, 1807 (Gastropoda) 27
Opinion 1293. *Scolia quinquecincta* Fabricius, 1793 (Insecta, Hymenoptera) 29
Opinion 1294. *Edwardsia* de Quatrefages, 1841 (Coelenterata, Actiniaria) 31
Opinion 1295. *Actinia* Linnaeus, 1767, ACTINIIDAE Rafinesque, 1815 (Coelenterata, Actiniaria) and *Pentacta* Goldfuss, 1820 (Echinodermata, Holothurioidea). 34
Opinion 1296. *Nettastomella* Carpenter, 1865 (Bivalvia) 37
Opinion 1297. *Xenocrepis pura* Mayr, 1904 (Insecta, Hymenoptera) . . 39
Direction 116. PAPILIONIDAE Latreille, [1802] (Insecta, Lepidoptera) . . 41
Direction 117. Correction of Entry No. 462 in the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology concerning *Sphaerium* Scopoli, 1777 (Mollusca, Bivalvia). (Correction to Opinion 94) 43

New and revived cases

Spiroglyphus Daudin, 1800 and *Stoa* De Serres, 1855 (Mollusca, Gastropoda, Vermetidae). A. Myra Keen & M. G. Hadfield . . 46

Continued on Inside Back Cover

Printed in Great Britain by Henry Ling Ltd., at the Dorset Press, Dorchester, Dorset

2102

27 June, 1985 Volume 42 Part 2
pp. iii–iv, 99–204

ISSN 0007-5167

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

The Official Organ of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

BRITISH MUSEUM
(NATURAL HISTORY)
26 JUL 1985
PURCHASED
ZOOLOGY LIBRARY

COMMONWEALTH AGRICULTURAL BUREAUX

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

Published by: **Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux**

On behalf of: **International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature**
c/o British Museum (Natural History)
Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

Orders and enquiries concerning subscriptions and back numbers should be sent to:

CENTRAL SALES
COMMONWEALTH AGRICULTURAL BUREAUX
FARNHAM ROYAL
SLOUGH SL2 3BN, U.K.

© *International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature 1985.* All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronically, mechanically, by photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia).*

Vice-President: Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden).*

Secretary: Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD).*

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of election or of most recent re-election)

Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden)* (30 September 1972) *(Vice-President)* **Arthropoda; Ecology**

Prof. Dr. Raphael ALVARADO *(Departamento de Zoologia, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Madrid, Madrid 28040, Spain)* (30 September 1972) **Echinoidea; Asteroidea**

Prof. E. BINDER *(Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle, CH 1211 Geneva 6, Switzerland)* (30 September 1972) **Mollusca**

Dr. L.B. HOLTHUIS *(Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Crustacea**

Dr. G. BERNARDI *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Lepidoptera**

Prof. C. DUPUIS *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) **Heteroptera**

Dr. M. MROCZKOWSKI *(Instytut Zoologiczny, Polska Akademia Nauk. ul. Wilcza 64, Warsaw, Poland)* (14 March 1975) **Coleoptera**

Prof. Dr. Otto KRAUS *(Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum, 2000 Hamburg 13, Germany)* (29 September 1976) **Arachnida, Myriapoda**

Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia)* (29 September 1976) *(President):* **Mammalia: Recent and Fossil**

Dr. H.G. COGGER *(Australian Museum, Sydney 2000, N.S.W. Australia)* (29 September 1976) **Reptilia: E D P Methods**

Prof. Dr. Gerhard HAHN *(Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universitätsgebiet Lahnberge, 3550 Marburg, BRD)* (27 December 1978) **Palaeontology**

Prof. Dr. O. HALVORSEN *(Institute of Biology and Geology, University of Tromsö, P.O. Box 790, N-9001 Tromsö, Norway)* (27 December 1978) **Parasitology**

Dr. V.A. TRJAPITZIN *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad B-164, USSR)* (27 December 1978) **Entomology**

Dr. F.M. BAYER *(U.S. National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) *(Councillor)* **Octocorallia; Systematics**

Prof. John O. CORLISS *(University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Protozoa; Systematics**

Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD)* (23 August 1979) *(Secretary)* **Palaeontology**

Dr. Y.I. STAROBOGATOV *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad 199164, U.S.S.R.)* (23 August 1979) **Mollusca, Crustacea**

Dr. P.T. LEHTINEN *(Zoological Museum, Department of Biology, University of Turku. SF-20500 Turku 50, Finland)* (8 August 1980) **Arachnida**
Dr. L.R.M. COCKS *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD)* (26 August 1982) **Brachiopoda**
Mr. David HEPPELL, *(Department of Natural History, Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh EH1 1JF, Scotland)* (26 August 1982) *(Councillor)* **Mollusca**
Prof. Jay M. SAVAGE *(Department of Biology, University of Miami, P.O. Box 249118, Coral Gables, Florida 33124, U.S.A.)* (26 August 1982) **Herpetology**
Prof. R. SCHUSTER *(Institut für Zoologie, Universität Graz, Universitätsplatz 2, A–8010 Graz, Austria)* (26 August 1982) **Acari**
Dr. SHUN-ICHI UENO *(Department of Zoology, National Science Museum, Hyakunincho 3-23-1, Shinjukuku, Tokyo 160, Japan)* (26 August 1982) **Entomology**
Prof. A. WILLINK *(Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, Instituto Miguel Lillo, Miguel Lillo 205, 4000 Tucumán, Argentina)* (26 August 1982) **Neotropical Hymenoptera**
Dr. G. C. GRUCHY *(National Museum of Natural Sciences, Ottawa, Canada, K1A 0M8)* (15 April 1985) **Ichthyology**

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Members of the Trust

Professor H.B. Whittington, F.R.S. *(Chairman)*
Dr. F.G.W. Jones *(Secretary and Managing Director)*
Prof. Per Brinck
Prof. J.H. Callomon
Prof. C.B. Cox
Mr. D. Curry
The Rt. Hon. the Earl of Cranbrook, F.L.S., F.Z.S.
Sir Arthur Drew, K.C.B.
Sir Charles Fleming, K.B.E., F.R.S.
Prof. J. Forest
Col. Francis J. Griffin, O.B.E.
Dr. G.C. Gruchy
Dr. R.H. Hedley, F.I.Biol.
Dr. L.B. Holthuis
Sir Peter Kent, F.R.S.
Prof. Dr. O. Kraus
Dr. M. Luc
Dr. I.W.B. Nye
Dr. E.P.F. Rose, T.D.
Dr. W.D.L. Ride *(ex officio)*
Sir Eric Smith, F.R.S.
Dr. G.B. White
Prof. J.M. Dodd, F.R.S. *(Observer for the Royal Society)*

B. The Officers of the Trust

Mr. R.V. Melville, M.Sc. *(Scientific Controller)*
Mr. M.E. Tollitt, M.Sc., F.L.S., F.R.E.S. *(Assistant Zoologist)*
Mr. J.D.D. Smith *(Administrator)*

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 42, part 2 (pp. iii–iv, 99–204) 27 June 1985

NOTICES

(a) *Invitation to comment.* The Commission is entitled to start to vote on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* six months after the publication of each application. This period is normally extended to enable comments to be submitted. Any zoologist who wishes to comment on any of the applications is invited to send his contribution, in duplicate, to the Secretary of the Commission as quickly as possible, and in any case in time to reach the Secretary within twelve months of the date of publication of the application.

(b) *Possible use of the plenary powers.* The possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers is involved in the following applications published in the present part of the *Bulletin*:

(1) *Southernia* Allgen, 1929: proposed conservation by suppression of *Southernia* Filipjev, 1927 (Nematoda). Z.N.(S.) 940. The Secretary.

(2) *Folsomia candida* Willem, 1902 (Insecta, Collembola): proposed conservation by suppression of *Entomobrya cavicola* Banks, 1897. Z.N.(S.) 2210. P. F. Bellinger.

(c) *Receipt of new applications.* The following new applications have been received since going to press for vol. 42 (1) (published on 2 April 1985) (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23b and 79c):

*(1) *Filellum* Hincks, 1868 (Coelenterata, Hydroida): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2508. P.F.S. Cornelius & D.R. Calder.

(2) *Neastacilla* Tattersall, 1921 (Crustacea, Isopoda): request for confirmation of type species. Z.N.(S.) 2509. H.M.L. Ton & G.C.B. Poore.

(3) ADERIDAE Winkler, 1927 (Coleoptera) and EUGLENIDAE Stein, 1878 (Flagellata): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2510. M. Mroczkowski & S. A. Slipinski.

(4) *Cyclaxyra* Broun, 1893 (Coleoptera, Cucujoidea): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2511. I.C. Watt & R.A. Crowson.

*(5) *Megalonaias* Utterback, 1915 (Mollusca): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2512. A.E. Bogan & J.D. Williams.

(6) 'Nomenclaturally valid': a useful new term in nomenclature. Z.N.(S.) 2513. R.V. Melville (Secretary).

(7) *Hydatigena taeniaeformis* Batsch, 1786 (Platyhelminthes, Cestoda): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2514. C.C. Bursey.

(d) *Guidelines for applications to the Commission.* Intending applicants should draw up their applications in line with the Guidelines published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, volume 42, part 1, pages 3–5. Copies of the Guidelines can be obtained from the Secretary.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

CHANGES IN THE COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

The retirement from the Commission of Dr Curtis W. Sabrosky (of the *Systematic Entomology Laboratory, United States Department of Agriculture, c/o United States National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) on reaching the age limit is recorded with great regret. Dr Sabrosky has given 22 years of painstaking and valuable service as a Commissioner; from 1977 until the spring of 1983 he was President. His contribution to the preparation of the 3rd Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature was of the highest value. My personal debt to his encouragement and friendship is immense.

Dr G. C. Gruchy (of the *National Museum of Natural Sciences, Ottawa, Canada*) was elected on 15 April this year to the place vacated by Professor Harold Welch. His speciality is Ichthyology.

THE INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE THIRD EDITION

This was published on 12 February 1985, for the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, by the British Museum (Natural History).

This new edition, with official French and English text on facing pages, has been approved by the International Union of Biological Sciences and is the only set of rules of worldwide authority that guides zoologists and palaeontologists who are describing new families, genera and species. It is an indispensable working tool for all taxonomists and those engaged in identification services in applied fields.

The price is £15 + £1.50 postage and packing. Pre-paid orders should be sent to the Publications Department, British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD. Orders from applicants in North America should be sent to the University of California Press, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90024, U.S.A.

R.V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
June 1985

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *DAPSILARTHRA* FOERSTER, 1862. Z.N.(S.)2312

(see vol. 41, pp. 53–55)

(1) By Dr G. C. D. Griffiths (*Department of Entomology, University of Alberta, Canada*)

I support the intent of van Achterberg's submission regarding the need to protect the name *Dapsilarthra* Foerster, 1862 against any possible attempt to substitute *Gnamptodon* Haliday, 1833 for it, but consider his exposition unnecessarily complex. Two issues are involved: what is the correct spelling of *Gnamptodon*/*Gnaptodon*, and which species should be recognised as the type species? Protection of *Dapsilarthra* will be automatic if the question of the type species of *Gnamptodon*/*Gnaptodon* is settled.

Gnamptodon and *Gnaptodon* are not different names but different spellings of the same name. When a name is spelt in two different ways in the same paper, this is evidence that one or other spelling is a lapsus or error of some kind. The fact that we are not dealing with two different names is shown by Haliday's inclusion of only *Bracon pumilio* Nees in *Gnaptodon* in 1837 and his citation of the same species as the type of *Gnaptodon* in 1840. Since the spelling *Gnamptodon* was used by Haliday at least three times (in 1833, 1837 and 1840, as cited by van Achterberg) while the spelling *Gnaptodon* appears only once (in 1837), clearly *Gnamptodon* was the intended spelling. Van Achterberg's preference for *Gnaptodon* is no doubt due to that spelling having been used in his 1983 revision and other recent literature. If recent usage is sufficient ground for the Commission to rule *Gnaptodon* to be the spelling to be used, I have no objection to this. But the case should be argued in terms of usage, not through the stratagem of treating *Gnamptodon* and *Gnaptodon* as different names when they are not.

A ruling on the type species of *Gnamptodon* Haliday, 1833 is needed because the type species, by monotypy, *Bassus rufiventris* Nees, [1812], was misidentified. This specific name is at present applied to an alysiine braconid placed in *Dapsilarthra*. In Haliday's (1833) key the gaping (exodont) mandibles characteristic of alysiine braconids are denoted by the phrase 'Mandibulae hiantes'. But *Gnamptodon*, with *rufiventris* as sole included species, is denoted by 'mandibulae forcipatae'. Therefore Haliday did not intend to apply the name to an alysiine braconid and it is not necessary to assume any change in Haliday's concept of *Gnamptodon* between 1833 and 1837. The species included in 1837, *Bracon pumilio* Nees, 1834, could represent the species misidentified as *Bassus rufiventris* in 1833, although this cannot be determined with certainty. Designation of *Bracon pumilio* Nees, 1834 as type species of *Gnamptodon* Haliday, 1833 would solve the problem and remove any possible threat to *Dapsilarthra*.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

Achterberg, C. van 1983. *Tijdschr. Entomol.*, vol. 126, pp. 25–57.

Nees von Esenbeck, C. G. D. 1834. *Hymenopterorum Ichneumonibus affinum monographiae* etc. Stuttgart and Tübingen.

(2) By R. Wharton (*Department of Entomology, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas*)

I should like to express my support for the proposal to conserve *Dapsilarthra* Foerster, 1862. I believe that the suppression of *Gnamptodon* Haliday, 1833 will result in greater stability and consistency of usage in the BRACONIDAE. However, I am surprised to find that the proposal is inconsistent with the radical changes the same author has proposed for generic names in this family, which are based on strict priority (van Achterberg, 1979, 1982).

Some minor points may be helpful to the Commission in considering this case: (1) *Dapsilarthra* in its widest sense has been the subject of recent studies by Königsmann, 1959, Griffiths, 1968a, b, Wharton, 1980 and van Achterberg, 1983. Griffiths and Wharton are at present rearing and collecting material to be used in a revision of the Nearctic species. *Dapsilarthra* is quite diverse (Wharton, 1980; van Achterberg, 1983) and is unlikely to be maintained in its present sense (Wharton, 1980). However, *D. apii* (Curtis, 1826), the type species of *Dapsilarthra*, and *D. rufiventris* (Nees), the type species of *Gnamptodon*, are in separate but apparently closely related species groups. Thus any reorganisation at the generic level will probably lead to the retention of both species in *Dapsilarthra* s.s.

(2) There are several generic names available for the species now placed in *Dapsilarthra*; and *Adelura* Foerster, 1862 has been used in the past about as frequently as *Dapsilarthra* (Shenefelt, 1974). Thus the contention that *Dapsilarthra* is '. . . long established and much used . . .' (vol. 41, p. 54, lines 28–29) is a weak argument for its conservation. The similar statement that '. . . *Dapsilarthra* has been used consistently for the genus since 1862 . . .' (vol. 41, p. 54, lines 24–25) is somewhat misleading because of the widespread use of *Adelura* until Strand, 1928, showed that it was a junior homonym. Even after this discovery, one of the most detailed biological studies on any species of *Dapsilarthra*, that by Keilin & Tate, 1943, used the combination *Adelura apii* (Curtis).

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

GRIFFITHS, G. C. D. 1968a. *Beitr. Entomol.*, vol. 18, pp. 5–62.
——— 1968b. *Beitr. Entomol.*, vol. 18, pp. 63–152.
KEILIN, D. & TATE, P. 1943. *Parasitology*, vol. 35, pp. 27–36.
KÖNIGSMANN, E. 1959. *Beitrs. Entomol.*, vol. 9, pp. 580–608.
SHENEFELT, R. 1974. *Hymenopterorum Catalogus* (nov. ed.) Pars 11, Braconidae 7, p. 986. Junk, The Hague.
STRAND, E. 1928. *Arch. Naturges.*, vol. 92(A), p. 51.
VAN ACHTERBERG, C. 1979. *Tijdschr. Entomol.*, vol. 122, pp. 241–279.
——— 1982. *Entomol. Ber.*, vol. 42, pp. 133–139.
WHARTON, R. A. 1980. *Univ. California Publs Entomol.*, vol. 88, pp. 1–112.

(3) Replies by Dr van Achterberg

(1) *to Dr Griffiths:* The statement that there is doubt about the identity of the nominal type species of *Gnamptodon* Haliday, 1833, p. 265 (where it is clearly indicated) and of *Gnaptodon* Haliday, 1837, p. 220, where only one species is included, is in my opinion incorrect. If the interpretation of these species by Haliday is taken as

the basis for the interpretation of the genera, the uncertainty about both names will continue. As Dr Griffiths correctly notes, there is no proof that Haliday's *Bracon pumilio* Nees, 1834, is the same as his *Bassus rufiventris* Nees, [1812], 1814; it is even unlikely. For instance, according to the original descriptions, the colour of the two species is very different and this should have been noted by Haliday. However, Haliday made some sort of mistake and the case should be settled to avoid possible confusion in the future.

(2) *to Dr Wharton:* I agree with most of these remarks. I prefer the application of generic names to be based strictly on priority. However, if this increases the chance of confusion (in this case, two generic names differing only in one letter, both proposed by the same author in a conflicting manner) the case should, in my opinion, be brought before the Commission. The solution proposed is to conserve the name most in use at the moment. Therefore whether the term 'much used' or another is used is not important: it is a relative statement. *Dapsilarthra* is commonly accepted as the name for the genus that includes *Bassus rufiventris* Nees, [1812], 1814 and *Alysia apii* Curtis, 1826 (see e.g. Shenefelt, 1974, pp. 986–991).

Adelura Foerster, 1862 (non Bonaparte, 1854; = *Adelurola* Strand, 1928) has been used extensively, but in terms of its type species it is not closely related to *Dapsilarthra*; its use for the group including *D. rufiventris* and *D. apii* was incorrect and cannot be accepted. Of the available names for this genus *Dapsilarthra* has indeed been the most consistently used since 1862.

(4) Note by the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

The Commission must clearly decide on the relative status of *Gnamptodon* Haliday, 1833 and *Gnaptodon* Haliday, 1837. On the direct evidence of the 1837 work, on the assumption that Haliday knew what he was doing, they must be regarded as separate names; for *Gnamptodon* is sunk as a synonym of *Opius (Opius)* Wesmael, 1835 (though it is difficult to see why), while *Gnaptodon* is a separate subgenus of *Opius*, with its own type species.

Furthermore, it is not necessary to treat *Gnaptodon* as a misspelling of *Gnamptodon*. The Greek verb gnampto means to bend or curve; the Greek word gnapto means to card or comb wool. Haliday was a good enough classicist to have known this.

I therefore conclude that Dr Griffiths' argument has little to sustain it and that Dr van Achterberg's original proposals should be preferred.

DESIGNATION OF A NEOTYPE FOR *ADIANTHUS BUCATUS* AMEGHINO, 1891 (MAMMALIA) UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS: A RESPONSE. Z.N.(S.)2430

(see vol. 41, pp. 56–57, 208–211)

(1) By Richard L. Cifelli (*Division of Mammals, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC, 20560, U.S.A.*)

A comprehensive review of the ADIANTHIDAE, published recently (Cifelli & Soria, 1983), includes detailed discussion of all issues raised by Schoch in his critique, which otherwise largely reiterates the substance of my joint proposal with

Soria for designation of a neotype (Cifelli & Soria, 1984). For clarification here and by way of summary, the review of Cifelli & Soria (1983):

(1) established the ADIANTHIDAE as a unique and holomonophyletic group pertaining to the indigenous South American order Litopterna (Mammalia). The morphological integrity of this group and its roster of constituent taxa have, however, been long and universally recognised (see primary zoological literature citations in Cifelli & Soria, 1983), so that modifiers used by Schoch such as 'presumably', 'usually', and 'certain authors', implying doubtful usage of this family-group name, are inappropriate in this context;

(2) provided diagnoses for the ADIANTHIDAE and for all subordinate taxa contained by the family;

(3) discussed the observable morphology of the type figure of *Adianthus bucatus* Ameghino, 1891 and of MACN A1812 (referred to that species by Ameghino in 1894) with respect to these diagnoses, concluding that the former pertained to a caviomorph rodent while the latter clearly represents a distinct species of ADIANTHIDAE as that family is universally conceived. Schoch's assertion to the contrary, the loss of the type specimen was in no way 'convenient' for us in making this evaluation or in assessing the possible solutions to the problem. While the description and figure of the type are sufficient to determine rodent rather than litoptern affinities for the original specimen, no more specific identification or assessment of validity is possible until more complete materials, including but not limited to another tooth sufficiently similar to it, are discovered. (It is conceivable, for instance, that the type of *Adianthus bucatus* belonged to a presently recognised species otherwise known only from the lower dentition.) Should the Commission designate MACN A1812 as neotype of *Adianthus bucatus,* thereby leaving the original type figure of that species nameless, it is therefore uncertain at present whether or not a new name will be required for it;

(4) selected and designated MACN A1812 as neotype of *Adianthus bucatus* Ameghino, 1891, noting that a proposal for action by the Commission on the matter had been made;

(5) presented all existing evidence as to the geographic and stratigraphic provenience of all materials pertaining to the ADIANTHIDAE. While it is virtually certain that the two specimens in question were collected from different localities, there is considerable doubt as to the origin of the type. MACN A1812 was obtained at a locality (Corriguen Aike) not visited by Carlos Ameghino—brother of Florentino Ameghino—when he made the collection which includes the type (Ameghino, 1913–1936, vol. 20, pp. 146 ff.). Available evidence, consisting of an oblique reference (Ameghino, 1903–1904a), implies but does not establish the locality (Karaiken) from which the type derived (Cifelli & Soria, 1983, p. 8); this locality is of a slightly earlier age (Marshall & Pascual, 1977) than that of MACN A1812.

2. Schoch's suggestion that, in accordance with Article 75 of the Code, 'it is logical to wait until more material of *Adianthus bucatus* is collected from the fauna from which it is derived and designate one such future specimen the neotype' is in contradiction with his acceptance (without restudy) of our contention that the figure and description given by Ameghino (1891) are adequate (designation of such a

neotype is thus excluded by the provisions of Article 75a). This is, in any case, irrelevant because the proposal concerns suppression of an existing type and designation of a neotype under Article 79, not Article 75, of the Code.

3. Aside from issues dealt with explicitly in the revision of the family (Cifelli & Soria, 1983), Schoch's sole stated objection to designation of MACN A1812 as neotype of *Adianthus bucatus* is that 'confusion will remain in the older literature'. Such confusion will inevitably remain. Because *Adianthus bucatus* has not universally been applied to a single species, *no* course of action (including, as Schoch advocates, retention of the species-name with the figure of the original type and its transferral to the Rodentia) will rectify confusion in the early literature except, perhaps, suppression of the name entirely. The evidence presented in a recent review (Cifelli & Soria, 1983) should, in any case, be sufficient to clarify misunderstanding due to an error made by Ameghino nearly 100 years ago and never correctable in a strict sense.

4. The promotion of stability is the expressed central purpose of the Code; that of the plenary powers, Article 79, to suspend the provisions of the Code 'if such application to a particular case would in its [the Commission's] judgment disturb stability or universality or cause confusion'. Designation of MACN A1812 as neotype of *Adianthus bucatus* Ameghino, 1891 would preserve usage and convention in concept of the species and therefore of the genus and of the family ADIANTHIDAE, whereas retention of the species name with the type figure, their removal to another order, and the erection of new names would cause considerable confusion. Designation of MACN A1812 as neotype would, first, preserve tradition in concept and usage (a tradition established, in fact, by Ameghino [1894] himself). *Adianthus bucatus* is a species universally considered as pertaining to a group of small, morphologically distinctive litopterns (see Cifelli & Soria, 1983, for literature citations). The name, if retained with the type figure, would be new to the Rodentia and, as noted above, is in this case presently of uncertain validity within that order (should, for instance, *Adianthus bucatus* be found to be synonymous with another described rodent species, further confusion could ensue). Secondly, and more fundamentally, designation of the neotype would permit maintenance of the family-group name ADIANTHIDAE. Because *Adianthus* (type species *A. bucatus*) is the type genus of the group of litopterns under consideration, removal of the species *Adianthus bucatus* from the family will necessitate application of another family-group name to them. No other such name has ever been proposed or used, so that the name would be entirely new to zoological nomenclature. Proposal of a new name would clearly have a disruptive effect on nomenclature: in addition to usage in the primary zoological literature (cited in Cifelli & Soria, 1983), the family-group name ADIANTHIDAE is widely cited in general reference works on South American mammal evolution (e.g., Patterson & Pascual, 1972; Simpson, 1980; Marshall *et al.*, 1983; Cifelli, 1985) and in comprehensive treatments of mammalian evolution, classification, and systematics (e.g., Trouessart, 1898–1899; Palmer, 1904; Simpson, 1945; Romer, 1966; Savage & Russell, 1983), which are standard reference works for non-specialists.

REFERENCES

AMEGHINO, F. [1891]. Caracteres diagnósticos de cincuenta especies nuevas de mamíferos fósiles argentinos. *Rev. Argentina Hist. nat.*, vol. 1, pp. 129–167.

—— 1894. Enumération synoptique des espèces de mammifères fossiles des formations éocènes de Patagonie. *Bol. Acas. nac. Cien. Córdoba,* vol. 13, pp. 259–452.

—— 1903–1904a. Nuevas especies de mamíferos cretácicos y terciarios de la República Argentina. *An. Soc. cien. Argentina,* vol. 56 (1903), pp. 193–208; vol. 57 (1904), pp. 162–175, 327–341; vol. 58 (1904), pp. 35–41, 56–71, 182–192, 225–240, 241–291.

—— 1913–1936. *Orbas completas y Correspondencia científica.* Edición oficial ordenada por el gobierno de la Provincia de Buenos Aires, Torcelli, A., ed. La Plata, Impresiones Oficiales, vols. 1–24.

CIFELLI, R. L. 1985. South American ungulate evolution and extinction. *In:* Webb, S. D. and Stehli, F., eds., *The Great American Interchange.* Plenum Publ. Co., New York, in press.

—— & SORIA, M. F. 1983. Systematics of the Adianthidae (Litopterna, Mammalia). *Amer. Mus. Novitates* no. 2771.

—— & SORIA, M. F. 1984. *Adianthus bucatus* Ameghino, 1891 (Mammalia): proposed designation of a neotype under the plenary powers. *Bull. zool. Nomen.,* vol. 41, pp. 56–57.

MARSHALL, L. G., HOFFSTETTER, R. & PASCUAL, R. 1983. Mammals and stratigraphy: geochronology of the continental mammal-bearing Tertiary of South America. *Palaeovertebrata,* Montpellier, Mém. Extr. 1983, pp. 1–93.

—— & PASCUAL, R. 1977. Nuevas marsupiales Caenolestidae del 'Piso Notohippidense' (SE de Santa Cruz, Patagonia) de Ameghino. Sus aportaciones a la cronología y evolución de las comunidades-mamífero del Cenozoico medio y tardio sudamericano. *Obra del Centenario Del Museo de La Plata,* vol. 5, pp. 11–28.

PALMER, T. S. 1904. Index generum mammalium: a list of the genera and families of mammals. *U.S. Dept. Agriculture Repts. North American Fauna,* no. 23, pp. 1–984.

PATTERSON, B. & PASCUAL, R. 1972. South American fossil mammals. *In:* Keast, A., Erk, F. C. and Glass, B. eds., *Evolution, Mammals, and Southern Continents.* State Univ. New York Press, Albany, pp. 247–309.

ROMER, A. S. 1966. *Vertebrate Paleontology,* 3rd edition. Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 1–468.

SAVAGE, D. E. & RUSSELL, D. E. 1983. *Mammalian Paleofaunas of the World.* Addison-Wesley Publ. Co., Reading, pp. 1–432.

SIMPSON, G. G. 1945. The principles of classification and a classification of mammals. *Bull. Amer. Mus. nat. Hist.* 85: 1–350.

—— 1980. *Splendid Isolation: The Curious History of South American Mammals.* Yale Univ. Press, New Haven, pp. 1–266.

TROUESSART, E.-L. 1898–1899. *Catalogus Mammalium tam Viventium quam Fossilium,* Nova Edito (Prima Completa). R. Friedländer und Sohn, Berlin, vol. 1–2: 1–1469.

(2) By M. F. Soria (*Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales 'Bernardino Rivadivia', Av. Angel Gallardo 470, [1405] Capital Federal, República Argentina*)

Dr Cifelli's reply to Dr Schoch covers most of the points that need to be dealt with, but I should like to add a few remarks.

(1) A simple reading of Schoch's comment shows his inadequate knowledge of the problem of *A. bucatus*, because he ignored (as Cifelli shows) our comprehensive reivew of the ADIANTHIDAE (Cifelli & Soria, 1983).

(2) Schoch's statement relies for much of its support on his paragraph 4, in which he misunderstood the sense given to the name *A. bucatus* by both Patterson, 1940 and Simpson & Minoprio, 1949:

> Patterson, 1940, compared his specimen not, as Schoch suggests, with the type specimen of *A. bucatus*, but with that of *A. patagonicus* Ameghino, 1904. On p. 17, footnote 3, he says of *A. bucatus*: '... from an examination of the inadequate figure, it is impossible to homologise the remaining two [fossettes] with the fossettes of other described specimens.'
>
> Simpson & Minoprio, 1949, referred to the genus *Adianthus* but not to *A. bucatus* by name. They clearly described features of the type specimen of *A. patagonicus*, as when, for instance (p. 7), they indicated the presence of a 'strong parastylar spur'. Ameghino's 1891 description and figure of the type specimen of *A. bucatus* show no such character.
>
> Starting from this confusion, Schoch states 'Thus workers have not universally applied the name *Adianthus bucatus* to the same species. Sometimes it is applied to the species represented by Ameghino's (1891) original, and presumably lost, type and sometimes to the the species represented by M.A.C.N. no. A1812'. This conclusion does not fit the facts. After Ameghino, 1891, all workers who have studied *A. bucatus* (Ameghino, 1894, 1896, 1898; Scott, 1910; Patterson, 1940; Simpson & Minoprio, 1949, 1950; Simpson, Minoprio & Patterson, 1962; Soria, 1981; Bond & Vucetich, 1983) have followed Ameghino's 1894 concept of the species, based on the hemimandible MACN A–1812 (Schoch's rendering of this number is incorrect). Occasional mentions of the original type (e.g. Patterson, 1940, see above) do not affect this. Schoch seems to have confused 'specimens' with 'species' and not to have distinguished between *A. bucatus* and *A. patagonicus.*
>
> Schoch states 'Scott (1910) and Soria (1981) mistakenly took M.A.C.N. no. A1812 [sic] to be the type or neotype [sic] of *Adianthus bucatus*'. In 1981 (p. 29) I wrote '... resultaría aceptable tomar la hemimandíbula como neotipo ...' ('... it would be acceptable to take the hemimandible as the neotype ...'). I did not say that the hemimandible *'was'* or *'must be'* the neotype. I compared the figure of the type specimen of *A. bucatus* with that of the type specimen of *A. patagonicus* (see also Cifelli & Soria, 1983). I concluded that those species are not congeneric and proposed the new combination *Proheptaconus patagonicus*. I based this on a comment by Simpson, Minoprio & Patterson, 1962, p. 248: 'We cannot attempt to solve or even state these problems here, and indeed their solution probably must await discovery of better post-Deseadean specimens and perhaps also arbitrary designation of neotypes or nomina conservanda'.

(3) The type specimen of *A. bucatus* is presumably lost, as Cifelli & Soria, 1983, 1984, point out. As Schoch appears not to agree, I offer the following information:

> (a) After his first description of 1891, Ameghino never mentioned the type again. Until 1904 *Adianthus* was a monotypic genus, so that up to that date any mention of the genus was equivalent to a mention of the type

species. In 1896, when he mentioned only the generic name, he cited the teeth features of the hemimandible MACN A–1812 alone. In 1903–1904a he described the second species of *Adianthus, A. patagonicus*, of which the type is an isolated third upper molar (MACN A-52-218), but he did not compare this with the type of *A. bucatus*. In his monograph on the phylogenetic morphology of ungulate upper molars, he figured only the type specimen of *A. patagonicus* (1904b, figs 98, 100).

(b) In 1900 Scott visited Ameghino but was unable to examine the Litopterna of the Ameghino collection for lack of time (Scott, 1910, p. 1). In his treatise on Santacrucian Litopterna (1910) he considered the hemimandible as the type specimen of *A. bucatus* and (p. 154) mentioned some features of the type specimen of *A. patagonicus* when discussing the genus. If Scott knew the type specimen of *A. bucatus* it is inexplicable that he did not refer to it, especially as he gave a reference to Ameghino, 1891.

(c) When the Ameghino Collection was incorporated in the Sección Paleozoología of the Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales 'Bernardino Rivadivia', all specimens were numbered and card-indexed. Under *A. bucatus* only the hemimandible MACN A–1812 was found and (erroneously) considered as the type.

(d) I have been working on the fossil mammal collections of the Museum (including the Ameghino Collection) since 1974. I have located many missing specimens and, of course, a good number of type specimens (many recorded in internal reports). I have searched especially for specimens believed to be lost. In several such searches I was unable to find the type specimen of *A. bucatus*.

(e) There is no evidence that any other worker has been able to examine this specimen. Had anyone been able to do so, I believe it would have been mentioned at least once in the last 94 years. For these reasons I believe that Schoch has no grounds for supposing that it was convenient for us that the type specimen was lost. We suspect that the type was lost during Ameghino's lifetime. Indeed, it was Ameghino, 1894, who set up the specimen MACN A–1812 as a sort of informal neotype.

Hence the proposal to designate MACN A–1812 as the neotype of *Adianthus bucatus* (Cifelli & Soria, 1983, 1984) is the best way to preserve stability and to respect the traditional criteria for the ADIANTHIDAE, for its type genus *Adianthus*, and for the type species of that genus, universally recognised as small and peculiar Litopterna. The other alternative, to propose a new name for the hemimandible with the removal of *A. bucatus* to the Rodentia, would merely increase the degree of confusion shown by the antecedents cited above, as pointed out by Cifelli in his reply. This would be contrary to nomenclatural stability.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

AMEGHINO, F. 1896. Sur l'évolution des dents des mammifères. *Bol. Acad. nac. Cienc. Cordoba*, vol. 14, pp. 381–517.

———1898. *Segundo censo de la República Argentina*. Capítulo I. Territorio. Tercera parte, Sinopsis geológico-paleontológica. Buenos Aires, Taller Tipográf. Penit. nac., vol. 1, pp. 113–225.

———1904b. Recherches de morphologie phylogénétique sur les molaires supérieures des ongulés. *An. Mus. nac. Buenos Aires*, vol. 3 (10), pp. 1–541.

BOND, M. & VUCETICH, M. G. 1983. *Indalecia grandensis* gen. et sp. nov. del Eocene Temprano del Noroeste Argentino . . . *Rev. Assoc. geol. Argentina*, vol. 38 (1), pp. 107–117.

SIMPSON, G. G. & MINOPRIO, J. L. 1950. La fauna del Deseadense de Mendoza. Resumen. Colaboración. *An. Soc. cient. Argentina*, vol. 149, pp. 245–253.

———,———& PATTERSON, B. 1962. The mammalian fauna of the Divisadero Largo formation, Mendoza, Argentina. *Bull. Mus. comp. Zool. Harvard*, vol. 117 (4), pp. 239–293.

COMMENTS ON THE APPLICATION CONCERNING *ATRACTOCERA LATIPES* MEIGEN, 1804. Z.N.(S.)2393

(see vol. 41, pp. 83–93, 211)

(1) By I. M. Kerzhner (*Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad 199034, U.S.S.R.*)

Professor I. A. Rubtsov has asked me, as Secretary of the Soviet committee on zoological nomenclature, to comment on the disputed views of this case put forward by him and by Dr Crosskey. I am not a dipterologist, but I prefer a stable nomenclature and objective information. Prof. Rubtsov has provided me with some facts but I have personally verified all the references and have studied many other sources not indicated by him. I use *latipes* throughout in the pre-1972 sense and do not differentiate between narrow and broad applications of the name (the latter for a group of sibling species) because I regard both usages as important. References to RAE followed by the year and number of the work reviewed are to the *Review of Applied Entomology Ser. B. Medical and Veterinary*. Nearly all the other references are to works already mentioned in the discussion.

Rubtsov puts forward the following arguments:

(1) *Medical and veterinary importance of the species.* — Rubtsov stated: 'As a very active bloodsucker it has great medical and veterinary importance. It is included in many monographs . . ., in many bulletins of WHO . . . and in hundreds of papers'. Crosskey & Davies, 1972, said, to the contrary: 'not a blackfly species of any medical and veterinary importance'. Crosskey, 1984, remarks: 'In North America and Europe . . . the species has no such importance, and indeed there are extraordinarily few biting records for it. There is some man–biting nuisance attributable to the species, but localised to eastern U.S.S.R. The species has never been the target of any control operation nor is it even mentioned in a recent book concerned with SIMULIIDAE as pests (Laird, 1981)'. The above statements are the only ones seen by me.

For the U.S.S.R. (half of the area of the species) Rubtsov, 1956, stated: 'Malicious bloodsucker. Attacks man and domesticated animals' and Gutsevich included the species ('mass attacks on man and livestock') in the Soviet *Great Medical Encyclopaedia* (ed. 2, 1961, vol. 19, p. 367). Neither of these references limits the pest to 'eastern U.S.S.R.'. I have also found references to 'important species biting man and livestock' (RAE 1983, 2007, Switzerland) and 'mass bloodsucking species' (RAE 1983, 2333, Czechoslovakia). In England it was shown by Davies and others, 1962, *Trans. r. entomol. Soc. London*, vol. 114, pp. 25–26, using serological methods, that the species feeds mostly on birds, predominantly domestic birds, but also on man and domestic animals. In Canada it is, and in England it is supposed to be (Davies *et al.*, loc. cit.; RAE 1976, 1333, etc.) a vector of leucocytozoonosis, a dangerous and widely distributed disease of domestic and wild birds (see Laird, ed., 1981, p. vii). References to bloodsucking habits, abundance and wide distribution of the species are numerous. Davies *et al.* (loc. cit.) analysed about 280 bitings of *latipes*, much more than of any other British species.

The title of Laird's 1981 book — *Blackflies: the future for biological methods in integrated control* — shows his concern. Crosskey's chapter on geographical distribution contains a table of 43 'more important' species in the world fauna with a note that not all vectors of leucocytozoonosis are included. It is the only general review of blackfly species as pests in the book and does not include *latipes*. But the species is mentioned in the book on 15 pages (add p. 292 to the index) in six papers by eight authors working in England, West Germany, Czechoslovakia, Canada and U.S.A. All used '*latipes*' or '*latipes* auctt.' and none mentioned '*vernum*'. This goes counter to Crosskey's arguments. In the index to the book I found only 14 other species mentioned on 14 or more pages.

(2) *Importance of* latipes *as a type species.* — This is not commented on by Crosskey & Davies, 1972 or Crosskey, 1984. Regardless of the taxonomic status of *Cnetha*, there will be no problem if Rubtsov's proposal is accepted. Otherwise, the type species of *Cnetha* and *Pseudonevermannia* will have to be designated by the Commission using its plenary powers (Art. 70a).

(3) *Doubtful status of the presumed holotype.* — Rubtsov suggested that the presumed holotype disagrees with Meigen's figure and with the known distribution of the species. Neither point is mentioned by Crosskey & Davies, 1972 or by Zwick & Crosskey, 1981, and only the second is discussed by Crosskey, 1984. He regards Rubtsov's suggestion that the specimen was received from France or England after 1804 as a 'remarkable, groundless and unwarranted assumption' although Zwick & Crosskey, 1981, correctly mentioned that Meigen received much material from various countries after 1804. In 1818 or later Meigen obtained the Baumhauer collection (50,000 specimens) mainly from western and southern France and including many small and delicate species of the suborder Nematocera to which the blackflies belong. English Diptera (but perhaps not Nematocera) were sent to Meigen by Leach (see Morge, 1974, pp. 121, 122, 'Leach' misprinted as 'Beach'; Meigen, 1818–1838, *Syst. Beschr. zweifl. Ins.*, numerous references to Baumhauer; for Leach see vol. 2, p. 348, vol. 3, p. 292, etc.).

According to Horn & Kahle, 1936, *Entomol. Beihefte Berlin-Dahlem*, vol. 3, p. 171, Meigen specimens, possibly including types, exist in Vienna, Bonn and Halle/Saale, besides Paris. I can add Berlin and Leningrad. No effort seems to have been made to study these specimens in revising Meigen's blackfly species.

The problem of 'types' in old collections is discussed by Mayr, 1969, *Principles of systematic Zoology*, para 13.48, and I agree with his conclusions: 'Evidence derived from old types must be treated with extreme care and discrimination and never be used to upset stable nomenclature.' I agree further with Rubstov that, even in the absence of any doubts about the holotype, conservation of the name in its accustomed use was necessary.

(4) *Usage of the name.* — Crosskey in Laird, ed., 1981, lists selected identification keys mostly published in taxonomic monographs. According to my calculations, 12 of these (for the Palaearctic, U.S.S.R., Scandinavia, British Isles, France, Roumania, Czechoslovakia, Italy, east Canada and parts of U.S.A.) use *latipes* and only two (for Iceland and Michigan) use *vernum*. Numerous papers in which this common and widespread species is used in ecological, physiological, parasitological and other studies and published before 1972 use *latipes*. For the post-1972 period I used the indexes to RAE. I agree that such evidence is not complete and that it does not reflect the nature and importance of publications, but I think it gives objective evidence on the usage of names, and in my opinion, usage is usage (Art. 79b(ii)) and cannot be discounted even if the author is dead or did not show awareness of the proposed nomenclatural changes. From 1972 to 1975, RAE indexes only *latipes* (except for Crosskey & Davies, 1972). From 1976 to 1984, number 5, 16 papers using *latipes* are given and 20 using *vernum*. Clearly, even in recent years, *vernum* has not acquired very considerably predominant usage.

The problem of a neotype is identical in both Rubtsov's proposal and Crosskey's counterproposal (for *vernum*). In both cases a neotype is desirable, but the identity of the species can be fixed by reference to Davies, 1966, as already indicated by Rubtsov.

(2) By Heide Zwick, *Limnologische Flussstation d. Max-Planck-Instituts f. Limnologie, Postfach 260, D–6407 Schlitz, West Germany*

I wish to comment on the proposal by Rubtsov (1984, *Bull. zool. Nom.* 41(2), pp. 83–86) and counter-proposal by Crosskey (*ibid.*, pp. 86–93) on the interpretation of the name *latipes* Meigen, 1804, and in particular to comment on paragraphs 9 and 13 of Rubtsov's application.

For more than 15 years I have studied SIMULIIDAE, and have spent much time elucidating the identity and status of European species described by early workers such as Enderlein, Fries, Friederichs, Lundström, Meigen, and Zetterstedt. A paper on Meigen's types has already been published (Zwick & Crosskey, 1981) and the results of studies on the other workers are now being prepared for publication. Thus I am well aware of the *latipes* — *vernum* problem, and I feel qualified to comment on the proposals.

I fully agree with Crosskey, and strongly support his arguments which have been made in accordance with the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. His proposal to introduce the name *vernum* Macquart, 1826 for *latipes* sensu auct., nec Meigen (Crosskey & Davies, 1972) has been accepted by most simuliid specialists. Even in countries where current literature can be difficult to obtain authors are beginning to use the name *vernum* (e.g. Jedlička, 1976; Joost & Zimmermann, 1983).

The main point which arises from Rubtsov's proposal (paragraph 9) seems to be that he does not accept that the single male in the Meigen collection under the name *latipes* is in fact the holotype male of *latipes* Meigen, 1804.

The Meigen collection of simuliids has been carefully looked after since it was purchased in 1840 by the Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris. So closely has it been looked after that it was not until 1969 that experienced simuliid workers first received permission to make genital preparations which are essential for identifying species. Earlier workers had to be content with examining unsatisfactory external features, and many of their identifications are no more than guesswork.

In 1978 I studied the male *latipes* of Meigen and I am convinced (like Crosskey & Davies, the first revising authors) that it is the male which Meigen refers to in his original description (1804) for the following four reasons:

(1) the male bears a label 'latipes' in Meigen's handwriting (note Zwick & Crosskey 1981, p. 227);

(2) Meigen very precisely noted: 'Ich fing nur einmal ein Männchen im Mai in einer Hekke'. The proper translation is: Only once I caught one male on a hedge in May. Later, in 1818, he repeated: 'Nur einmal im Mai das Männchen'. (Translation: Only once a male [was caught] in May) and gave a more detailed description which evidently must have been based on the same specimen as in 1804;

(3) in the old catalogue of the Paris Museum (from 1840 — compare fig. 1 in Zwick & Crosskey, 1981) there are 2 specimens mentioned under the name of *latipes* (No. 525). Two specimens are in the collection of Meigen: one being a male, the other being a female (which has not been mentioned by Meigen) and misidentified;

(4) the figure of *latipes*, drawn by Meigen (pl. 223, fig. 9) shows a male and is in accordance with his descriptions.

I cannot agree with Dr Rubtsov's argument that because the male in question has no collecting label it may have been added to the collection subsequently. At the time of Meigen it was not usual to give locality information on labels. Furthermore, if it was a subsequently added specimen, it would mean that the holotype male was lost and someone must have placed another male in the correct place and added the handwritten label of Meigen onto the pin!

Taking all these points into account I consider that there is no reason to reject this specimen as being the holotype of *latipes* Meigen. If even more absolute proof is required before this conclusion can be accepted by others we may as well stop all our efforts to identify and revise the type-specimens of early authors [and thereby lose one of our fundamental bases in taxonomy].

Paragraph 13.

In my view a neotype is not needed for *latipes* Meigen, 1804. I consider that the specimen in the MNHN, Paris, number 525, is the holotype of *latipes* Meigen, 1804 as shown by the first revising authors (Crosskey & Davies, 1972). The name *vernum* Macquart, 1826 has been successfully introduced for the species *latipes* sensu auct. (= sensu Edwards, 1915, 1920; Rubtsov, 1956, 1959–1964; Davies, 1966, 1968).

To the best of our knowledge types of *vernum* Macquart do not exist, and the designation of a neotype would be desirable. However, this is not necessary at the moment, and should only be done by a specialist who is revising all species of the *vernum*-group.

Finally, I would like to comment on Rubtsov's paragraph 12. The type locality of *vernum* Macquart is most probably northern France, as Macquart lived at Lille. Despite a special collecting trip by Dr L. Davies to this area at the right time (May), there is still no appropriate specimen available to make a neotype designation. The only specimens I could provide are from Schlitz, Federal Republic of Germany, some 300 km east of Lille, and these would not be appropriate for such an important designation.

REFERENCES

CROSSKEY, R. W. & DAVIES, L. 1972. The identities of *Simulium lineatum* (Meigen), *S. latipes* (Meigen) and *S. vernum* Macquart (Diptera: Simuliidae). *Entomologist's Gaz.* vol. 23, pp. 249–258.

JEDLIČKA, L. 1976. Black flies (Diptera, Simuliidae) spread in middle Slovakia. *Acta F.R.N. Univ. Comen.* — Zoologia vol. XX, Bratislava, pp. 97–127.

JOOST, W. & ZIMMERMANN, W. 1983. *Dreijährige Emergenz-Untersuchungen an einem rhithralen Gewässer des Thüringer Waldes als Beitrag zur Ökologie, inbesondere Produktionsbiologie merolimnischer Fraktionen der Bergbach-Biozönose.* — Dissertation zur Promotion A. Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig, Sektion Biowissenschaften, Leipzig, Juni 1983, 275 pp. + XLII pp.

ZWICK, H. & CROSSKEY, R. W. [1981]. The taxonomy and nomenclature of the blackflies (Diptera: Simuliidae) described by J. W. Meigen. *Aquatic Insects*, vol. 2 (1980), pp. 225–247. [issued in 1981].

(3) By Jan E. Raastad (*Zoological Museum, Oslo University, Oslo, Norway N–0562*)

It is correct, as stated by Rubtsov, that *latipes* sensu Edwards, now commonly recognised as *vernum* Macquart, 1826, is very common and widely distributed and that it is a very active blood sucker. However, the species seems to be almost exclusively a bird biter of little or no veterinary medical importance. The species will therefore be of little practical interest, but for the taxonomist much time-consuming work will be caused by an attempt to separate what are possibly sibling species covered under the shadow of a long-standing misidentification.

This species has for long been placed in the genus-group taxon *Eusimulium* Roubaud, 1906. Rubtsov, 1974, *AN SSR Trudy zool. Inst.* vol. 53, pp. 230–281, erroneously split *Eusimulium* and re-assessed *Cnetha* Enderlein, 1921, which correctly has *Atractocera latipes* Meigen, 1804 as type species. Raastad, 1979, *Rhizocrinus*, vol. 11, pp. 1–28, argued against this course and re-evaluated *Cnetha* Enderlein, 1921, which is based on *latipes* Meigen sensu Enderlein.

It seems reasonable to question the identity of the species that was before Enderlein. Was it *latipes* Meigen, 1804, or *latipes* auctorum? Enderlein does not say much about this species, which he clearly did not know very well, and there is not much in the literature to clarify the matter. However, in 1936 (*Tierwelt Mitteleuropas*, vol. 6 (3)2, pp. 36–42 he presents a fairly accurate drawing (fig. 82) of the third leg of a female *Cnetha latipes* showing a deep tibial pedisulcus. This shows that Enderlein was not basing his *Cnetha* on the true *latipes* Meigen as that species has only a very shallow pedisulcus. Apparently Enderlein followed Edwards (*Bull entomol. Res.* vol. 6, pp. 23–42) in his misidentification of *latipes* Meigen. If so (and this is what we have to assume), *Cnetha* is a genus based on a misidentified type species and *vernum* Macquart, 1838 would be its most suitable type species.

Thus there is not much to support Rubtsov's view. On the contrary, his proposal means a threat to existing stability of nomenclature. To follow his application would mean setting back simuliid taxonomy at least 10 years. I must therefore fully support the alternative action proposed by Crosskey.

(4) By R. W. Crosskey (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

I had not intended to advert again to Rubtsov's request concerning the simuliid specific name *latipes* Meigen, 1804, but the comments by Dr Kerzhner in support of Rubtsov's position do not give a sufficiently exact account of the situation; further comment is now needed on matters raised by Dr Kerzhner so that the Commission can be more fully informed before deciding its standpoint.

Three main issues are involved in Rubtsov's request and in my opposition to it (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 41, pp. 83–93, 1984). They are:

(1) Is the male specimen accepted as the holotype of *latipes* Meigen, 1804, by Crosskey & Davis, 1972, to be recognised and treated as the holotype or not?

(2) Even if it is held to be the holotype, are there grounds for disregarding its characters and interpreting *latipes* in its misidentified sense? That is to say, are there grounds for reverting to pre-1972 usage based on a then-unrecognised misidentification and for maintaining 'usage'.

(3) What is the type species of *Cnetha* Enderlein, 1921, a genus based on the nominal species *latipes* Meigen, 1804?

(1) *The holotype question.* Dr Heide Zwick has dealt so carefully and effectively with this matter in her comment (pp. 111–113) that there can be no reason to doubt that the male specimen labelled by Meigen as *latipes* (Paris Museum) is the one referred to in Meigen's works. There is *no* contrary evidence, and therefore no ground for not accepting it as the holotype.

Kerzhner refers to the 'doubtful status of the presumed holotype', though it is hard to see how it can be doubtful in the light of Zwick's comments. As I stressed earlier, if we do not accept evidence of the kind marshalled by Zwick as sufficiently conclusive for type status then we might as well cease all attempts to fix the identity of early-described species by objective appeal to their types.

In his comments Kerzhner disputes the Crosskey and Zwick interpretation of the specimen as holotype on the grounds that Meigen received Diptera from various sources (including France and England) after the 1804 description of *latipes* and might have substituted another specimen for the original one. Rubtsov and Kerzhner appear to assume that this actually happened, but provide no substantiating evidence that it did or even might have done. References by Kerzhner to

Meigen's receipt of dipterous specimens from England and France do nothing to support the Rubtsov-Kerzhner position. As I said previously, 'there is no documentary evidence that Meigen ever received *simuliid* material from these countries' (I stress the word simuliid because Kerzhner appears to have overlooked it and to have assumed that my statement referred to Diptera as a whole). Meigen described certain other Diptera from these countries in his 1818 et seq. works, but not simuliids. Rubtsov's statement (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 41, p. 84) that *subexcisum* (=*latipes*) 'has never been found in West Germany' is not correct. It was found there a few years ago by Prof. Dr W. Rühm at Brückel (Hannover) (unpublished, Zwick to Crosskey, in *litt.* 23. ii. 1985), and is currently being reported from West Germany at the present time (Erpelding, in press).

On the type question, Kerzhner states that some of Meigen's Diptera material 'possibly including types' is present in Museums other than in Paris. This is correct, and a few of Meigen's nominal species of SIMULIIDAE were described from Austria — a fact giving rise to the obvious likelihood that the types of these species could be preserved in Vienna. However, *for the* SIMULIIDAE, there is no actual or presumptive evidence for the existence of original specimens in a collection other than Meigen's own (since 1840 in Paris Museum) or possibly in that of the Naturhistorisches Museum in Vienna. Paris and Vienna are the only two locations in which Meigen types of SIMULIIDAE can reasonably be expected to be found and recognised. In criticism of the Zwick-Crosskey acceptance of the Paris specimen as *latipes* holotype, Kerzhner attempts to imply that because some Meigen Diptera found depositories other than Paris the *latipes* type did also. This is a tendentious argument that he attempts to support by a statement that Zwick and Crosskey apparently made 'no effort' to study Meigen specimens that might or might not be in collections other than Paris.

In fact, Zwick and Crosskey could not have written their account of Meigen's simuliids without considering the nominal species for which Vienna was the likely depository (on the basis of the descriptions). No Meigen simuliids are present today in Vienna, as was made clear throughout the Zwick & Crosskey 1981 work. With the aid of the dipterist at the Naturhistorisches Museum, Vienna, this collection was searched for any specimens that might, by any possibility, be Meigen types of simuliids recorded by him from Austria; none was found (nor, it should be noted, in German collections examined by Zwick, including Berlin). Kerzhner's implication of negligence by Zwick and Crosskey is unfounded.

Kerzhner has not commented on Rubtsov's own acceptance of certain specimens in Paris as Meigen simuliid types, for example (Rubtsov, 1963, p. 546) that of *Simulium argyreatum* Meigen, 1838 on which Rubtsov comments 'Die uns im Jahre 1958 gebotene Gelegenheit, die Typen von Meigen im Muséum d'Histoire naturelle in Paris (1 Männchen) . . .'. It is not evident from Rubtsov's application or Kerzhner's support of it why they consider the Crosskey–Davies–Zwick acceptance of type status for the *latipes* specimen in Paris is suspect when the Rubtsov interpretation for other types is apparently not.

The information given by Kerzhner that there is Meigen material in Leningrad, if correct, is unfamiliar to most dipterists but is in any case irrelevant: Rubtsov has worked with the Leningrad collection for some 50 years and would long since have found any Meigen specimens of SIMULIIDAE.

In summary, Rubtsov and Kerzhner appear to have made no case justifying an assumption that the male specimen of *latipes* so named in Meigen's hand is *not* a type specimen. I therefore continue to request that the Commission rule that this specimen is to be accepted as the holotype of *Atractocera latipes* Meigen, 1804.

(2) *Maintenance of* latipes *in the sense of pre-1972 usage*. My comments here allude to Kerzhner's comments Nos. 1 and 4 together, as if there is an argument favouring the maintenance of pre-1972 usage of the name *latipes* it can only be hung on the putative medico–veterinary importance of the species concerned — the one renamed as *vernum* Macquart after reinterpretation of *latipes* from its holotype.

I do not differ from Kerzhner in the view that usage of a name should in some circumstances be maintained, and it is important that the Commission should use its plenary powers from time to time (in the interests of stability) to preserve a well-known name when it is threatened by a technical provision of the Code. But such action should be used sparingly, and only when a very important animal is concerned — e.g. a severe pest, pathogen, or disease vector for which the name has significance to more than a small group of specialists.

The blackfly species to which the name *latipes* Meigen was for a long time misapplied cannot by any reasonable yardstick be regarded as an important pest of man or livestock, despite the attempts of Rubtsov and Kerzhner to depict it in this light. It is unknown to all but workers on SIMULIIDAE, although familiar to a range of specialists of various kinds working in the context of this family. It takes bloodmeals mainly from birds, but in parts of its range also from mammals. Most simuliid species are bloodsuckers, and several hundred have been reported to bite man and domestic animals, but we do not on that account regard every one as a pest—with a sacrosanct name that must never be changed in the light of better taxonomic knowledge.

In the *latipes* case it is essential to distinguish between reports of bloodsucking by this species *per se*, and reports that provide evidence that this bloodsucking is a serious menace to man or livestock. Kerzhner's comments seem to equate one with the other. A specific example is his reference to Davies *et al.* (1962), who showed that wild-caught flies in Britain had fed on birds. What has this to do with pest status for *latipes* sensu authors in Britain? Kerzhner does not note that, later, in his definitive monograph of British Simuliidae, Davies (1966, p. 442) could only say this of its habits — 'Adult females appear to bite birds, although there is no precise knowledge of the species of birds attacked'. Also, Dr Kerzhner will not be aware that in the last 16 years I have collected *latipes* sensu authors from 203 breeding sites in England and not once either seen, or been bitten by, the adult fly. The species has no pest status in Britain, but the paper of Davies *et al.* (1962) was, as Kerzhner notes, abstracted in the *Review of Applied Entomology*. The importance of the point here is that citations of *latipes* sensu authors in the secondary recording periodicals, upon which both Rubtsov and Kerzhner have laid stress, are not *evidence* for an assertion of major pest status; if the primary literature is traced it will be found that almost all the secondary citations (in the RAE, WHO works, etc) relate to no more than casual findings on bloodsucking. This is so even for the work specifically selected for reference by Kerzhner: the bloodfed flies reported by Davies *et al.* were not found as part of a special investigation prompted by the bloodsucking habit but were precipitin-tested to determine the blood-source (mammalian or avian) after being incidentally trapped.

Kerzhner mentions Crosskey in Laird, 1981, a work in which I published a list of the major simuliid pests. A serious pest cannot be precisely defined. A 'short list' of major pests on a world scale must be selective, disregarding occasional or localised less severe pests in areas where really important ones also occur. My list excluded *latipes* (sensu authors, not Meigen) because — although a nuisance in parts of the steppe/forest-steppe — it does not on any reasonable assessment have the same socio-economic significance as the major simuliid pests of the U.S.S.R. (which *are* included in the table). Kerzhner says that *latipes* is mentioned on 15 pages in Laird, 1981. So it is, but in no case as a pest.

To urge a case for the maintenance of usage requires an exaggerated argument by which a minor pest status for *latipes* (sensu authors, not Meigen) in the U.S.S.R. is allowed to hold sway as if it were representative of the importance of the species throughout its enormous Holarctic range. Despite the importance that Rubtsov and Kerzhner claim for the species in the U.S.S.R. they cannot point to any work specifically on the control of this putatively important pest. The reason for this is that it has never been the target of any insecticidal or biological control programme: it is not so important a pest. Notably, the other specialists commenting on the case (from Canada, Germany, Norway, where the species occurs) have not mentioned that it is a pest in these areas. Raastad (pp. 113–114) specifically says that it has little or no medico-veterinary importance, and Cupp & Gordon, 1983, for the U.S.A., summarise (as *vernum*) its 'Medical-veterinary importance' thus: 'occasional [biting] nuisance in New York and Michigan'. It is probable, as Kerzhner says, that the species transmits (in common with many other ornithophilic simuliids) the protozoan parasite *Leucocytozoon*, but it is not among the few simuliid species that are the carriers of *economically important* leucocytozoonosis amongst poultry in North America.

Kerzhner points out, as part of Rubtsov's case, that the name *latipes* has gone on being used in its old usage sense in the literature of several countries, despite Crosskey & Davies (1972) having adopted (because of misidentification revealed by the type) the name *vernum* Macquart for it. This is true, but it would be surprising if it was otherwise — because it takes a while for corrections to nomenclature to become generally known, and because Rubtsov's taxonomic papers are influential source-works. Workers in the U.S.S.R. and a few elsewhere (relying on Rubtsov's works) have naturally continued to use *latipes* in the traditional sense, not being aware of the misidentification. Rubtsov in fact ignored the Crosskey & Davies 1972 work from the time of its publication up to his application to ICZN (1983), though he has in his work just published (Rubtsov & Yankovsky, 1984), whilst continuing the use of *latipes* in its misidentified sense, now cited it in a footnote (p. 103).

In defence of usage Kerzhner argues that in his opinion 'usage is usage', unconnected with whether an author 'is dead or did not show awareness of the proposed nomenclatural changes': in other words, ignorant use of a name is just as important in deciding the merits of a case involving *misidentification* as informed use, and the usage of names by authors who never knew of the nomenclatural problem at all (because dead or scientifically inactive) just as relevant as that of aware and actively involved specialists.

If the *latipes* case concerned a nomenclatural change brought about by *synonymy*, i.e. because an even older (pre-1804) name applying to the *same* species had been 'lost' for a century or two and then been used to supplant *latipes* Meigen as its senior synonym, I would be in full agreement with Rubtsov and Kerzhner. In such a circumstance it would obviously have been very detrimental to stability of nomenclature to have supplanted the use of *latipes*, and preservation of the junior synonym would have been extremely desirable. In such a situation mere counting of literature 'usages' could be meaningful and relevant to a Commission decision. It is *not* relevant where — as in the actual case under consideration — the question is not one of straightforward synonymy (involving the same species) but one of misidentification (involving different species). In the latter circumstance what matters most is the literature and usage *after* the misidentification has been discovered and made known — for this alone determines whether the action taken by the discoverer(s) of the misidentification has been deemed correct and desirable by authors au fait with the new situation.

The prime point for the Commission to consider is, therefore, not how many times the word *latipes* happens to have appeared in the literature, but whether the nomenclatural change first introduced by Crosskey & Davies, 1972, in the light of new evidence has or has not been accepted by the generality of those working on SIMULIIDAE — in particular by the specialists in taxonomy (who in turn influence the use of names in the non-taxonomic sphere). Supporting comments (this issue of BZN) for the nomenclatural readjustments introduced by Crosskey & Davies, 1972, and restated by Zwick & Crosskey, 1981, as they emanate from taxonomists in several countries, indicate that predominating specialist opinion favours the use of the name *vernum* Macquart for *latipes* sensu authors, not Meigen.

In summary, the blackfly species *latipes* sensu Edwards, etc. (*vernum* Macquart) is not a familiar pest of such over-riding importance that the Commission should give it exceptional nomenclatural treatment and rule in favour of pre-1972 usage, and Kerzhner fails to make a case that it is. He similarly does not establish that perpetuation of the name in its misidentified application is wanted by taxonomists aware of the nomenclatural situation. In fact, comments submitted on the case strongly suggest otherwise.

3. *The type-species of* Cnetha *Enderlein*. The genus *Cnetha* Enderlein was first described in an identical key published almost simultaneously in two periodicals (Enderlein, 1921a p. 199 and 1921b p. 44). Eight nominal species were included, and '*latipes* (Meig. 1804)' was designated as the type species (original designation) in both works.

Enderlein continued subsequently to recognise his genus as valid in SIMULIIDAE, mentioning *Cnetha* in 13 additional works published between 1921 and 1936. Limits of the genus fluctuated, some species being added and others removed, but the nomenclatural pivot was consistently *latipes* (Meigen, 1804) and was cited as such in two of the 13 post-original works in which the genus was mentioned (Enderlein, 1925, 1930).

It is not in doubt that Enderlein misidentified the species he designated as type species of *Cnetha*. He used the specific name *latipes* Meigen, both when he founded *Cnetha* upon it and subsequently, in exactly the same sense as his predecessor Edwards (1915, 1920): neither specialist saw Meigen's material or ever became aware that their sense of *latipes* was different from Meigen's. This is clear from the characters consistently cited by Enderlein as defining or categorising *Cnetha* and *latipes*, and Dr Raastad deals with this point in his comments.

To confirm Enderlein's misidentification beyond any possible doubt, however, I have examined (whilst preparing these comments) specimens identified by him and still in the Berlin Museum (loaned to me by courtesy of Dr H. Schumann). There are three pinned adult male specimens bearing Enderlein's determination labels dated 1920 or 1921, i.e. at or about the time of *Cnetha* description (1921); each is accompanied by an excellent preparation (Canada Balsam on celluloid) of one hind leg and dissected genitalia. One specimen from Silesia has his 1921-date identification label as 'Cnetha latipes (Meig.)', and the other two from Lødingen, Norway, have his 1920 and 1921 determination labels as 'Simulium latipes Meig.' and 'Cnetha latipes (Meig.)' respectively. The dilated hind basitarsus, genital parts, and all other characters, are those diagnostic for the morphospecies *latipes* sensu Edwards, and not for *latipes* Meigen as interpreted from its holotype, i.e. they are the characters of the morphospecies *vernum* Macquart following the Crosskey & Davies (1972) use of this name for the misidentified *latipes* of earlier authors. Enderlein's misidentification is unequivocally confirmed from the Berlin Museum specimens named by him as *latipes* Meigen.

According to Kerzhner's comment No. 2 the problem of the misidentified type species of *Cnetha* was 'not commented' upon by Crosskey & Davies, 1972, when they published on the true identity of *latipes*. Contrary to what Kerzhner says, these authors dealt with this aspect in a special comment (p. 254 of their paper) as follows: 'Lastly with regard to *latipes* Meigen we call attention to the fact that this nominal species is the type species of *Cnetha* Enderlein, 1921, and of *Pseudonevermannia* Baranov, 1926, both of which are based on a misidentified type species in view of the true identity of *latipes*. No practical problem of nomenclature arises as *Cnetha* and *Pseudonevermannia* remain in synonymy with *Eusimulium* Roubaud regardless of the misidentification; the case does not therefore require submission to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at this time'. What more should these authors have said on the matter?

Enderlein's highly split generic system found little favour, and *Cnetha* was hardly at all used as the valid name for a genus-group taxon until Rubtsov, 1974, restored it to generic use for the '*latipes*' (authors) species group previously in *Eusimulium* Roubaud. Baranov, 1936, adopted *Cnetha* as valid for a genus, and Vargas *et al.*, 1946, for a subgenus, both citing *latipes* Meigen as its type; these are the only authors who gave validity to *Cnetha* until Rubtsov, 1974. Neither of them knew of the misidentification, and each used the then universally accepted meaning of *latipes*. In the period 1936–1974 such few other authors as mentioned *Cnetha* listed the name as a synonym, either of *Simulium* Latreille (e.g. Smart, 1945) or of *Eusimulium* (e.g. Edwards, 1931; Rubtsov, 1962; Stone, 1963); synonymy with *Eusimulium* was the status quo for *Cnetha* at the time the misidentification of its type species was discovered.

The finding that *latipes* Meigen had been misidentified had at the time (1972) no nomenclatural bearing on genus-group names because both the actual and the misidentified species were still placed in the same genus-group taxon (*Eusimulium* as genus or subgenus) and the generic names based on *latipes* (*Cnetha* and *Pseudonevermannia*) were long-buried synonyms. The situation is changed now that Rubtsov (1974 et seq.) uses *Cnetha* as the name for a genus considered by him to be valid, and (as Kerzhner says) it is desirable for the Commission to determine what the type species of *Cnetha* (also *Pseudonevermannia*, see later) should be. This is particularly necessary because, to complicate the issue, the species *named* by Enderlein as type of *Cnetha* no longer belongs to the same genus-group taxon as the one intended to be the type. Rivosecchi & Cardinali, 1975, erected the genus *Hellichiella* for the assembly of species known to their predecessor authors either as the *annulum* or the *subexcisum* group within *Eusimulium*, designating *H. saccai* (Rivosecchi, 1967) as type species. Rubtsov & Yankovsky, 1982, erected the genus *Boreosimulium* also for the *annulum* group, designating *B. annulum* (Lundström, 1911) as type species, and indicating that it included the 10 species of that group (one of which is *subexcisum*, i.e. *latipes* Meigen). In their latest work Rubtsov & Yankovsky, 1984, have restricted *Hellichiella* to its type species, and have placed all other *annulum-subexcisum* group species in *Boreosimulium*.

From the situation as described it follows that, because the correctly interpreted name *latipes* Meigen is a senior synonym of *subexcisum*, the effect of designating the species *named* as type species of *Cnetha* Enderlein would be to make this name a senior synonym of *Boreosimulium* (and of *Hellichiella* also, for other taxonomists who prefer not to adopt the refined taxonomic splitting favoured by the Russian workers mentioned). *Hellichiella* is becoming well accepted as a valid name for the taxon containing *latipes* Meigen, recently used for example (as also *latipes* in its correct sense with *subexcisum* as its synonym) in the cytological work of Rothfels & Golini, 1983. There would be no virtue in switching the name *Cnetha* to a concept that has never borne it before and at the same time forcing into synonymy at least one and probably two recently proposed and currently used generic names; the Commission is asked therefore, in determining the type species of *Cnetha*, not to fix the species *named* by Enderlein, but instead to fix the one actually before Enderlein that he intended to be the type.

If the actual species on which Enderlein based *Cnetha*, not the one he named, is fixed as type species, stability is maintained and Rubtsov's (1974 et seq.) concept for this taxon is upheld; the name can continue in use for the *same* taxon as that to which it is and has in the past been applied (i.e. to an assemblage of species centring on *latipes* sensu Edwards, not Meigen). This preserves Rubtsov's application of the name *Cnetha*.

The last question for the Commission concerning *Cnetha* is by what name this species, the one actually used by Enderlein to found the genus, should be known. I have already put the case (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol 41, pp. 86–93) that this species should be known as *vernum* Macquart, following the taxonomic clarification of Crosskey & Davies 1972 and acceptance of their action by a majority of workers since. As a corollary I now ask the Commission to designate *Simulium vernum* Macquart, 1828, as type species of *Cnetha*.

As a 'tidying-up' operation, the type species of *Pseudonevermannia* Baranov should be fixed by the Commission whilst dealing with that of *Cnetha*. The situation is comparable. This name was proposed (Baranov, 1926, p. 164) for a new subgenus in a key to subgenera of *Simulium*, with '*latipes* Meig. 1804' cited as type species. It was never mentioned again by Baranov in his substantial oeuvre on SIMULIIDAE, although he subsequently (Baranov, 1935, p. 100; 1936, p. 191) assigned the type species to *Cnetha*, implicitly but not explicitly recognising the objective synonymy of his *Pseudonevermannia* with *Cnetha*. No author since its description has used *Pseudonevermannia* as a valid name, and it has been listed only a few times as a synonym, e.g. of *Nevermannia* Enderlein by Rubtsov, 1940, of *Simulium* by Smart, 1945, of *Cnetha* by Vargas *et al.*, 1946, and of *Eusimulium* by Stone, 1963 and Crosskey, 1969. It is certain from Baranov, 1927, where he figured the branching of the four-filamented pupal gill (under the name *Nevermannia latipes*) and from his mention of such a gill in the original characterisation for *Pseudonevermannia*, that Baranov based this taxon on the same actual species as that used by Enderlein to found *Cnetha*, the species now known to be misidentified, and to which *vernum* is now applied. As *Pseudonevermannia* is isogenotypic with *Cnetha* both nominal genera should be similarly treated in determining their type species.

Conclusion and request for action

Rubtsov and Kerzhner have not satisfactorily shown: (a) that the specimen accepted as holotype of *latipes* Meigen by Crosskey & Davies, 1972, does not have such status; or (b) that *latipes* sensu Edwards is a pest of such severity that it warrants the intervention of the Commission to ensure continued application of the name *latipes* Meigen to it; or (c) that the name *vernum* Macquart now in use for the misidentified *latipes* sensu Edwards has not found general acceptance.

I agree with them that the type species of *Cnetha* Enderlein, nominally based on *latipes* Meigen, needs to be decided by the Commission now that the name is in use again by some authors as the valid name for a genus-group taxon.

There has not as yet been a need for specialists to redescribe *Simulium vernum* Macquart under this name. In practice the morphospecies concerned is identified by reference to descriptions and figures of it under the former name *latipes*. As Dr Davies (now retired) coauthored the original paper establishing the existence of the misidentification, I suggest (in agreement with the last paragraph of Dr Kerzhner's comment) that the Commission should rule that the name *S. vernum* Macquart is to be interpreted by reference to the specimens described and figured by Davies, 1966, 1968, under the misapplied name *Simulium latipes* Meigen.

I therefore wish to replace my original requests by the following. I now ask the Commission:

(1) under the plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genera *Cnetha* Enderlein, 1921 and *Pseudonevermannia* Baranov, 1926 and to designate *Simulium vernum* Macquart, 1826 as the type species of both nominal genera;

(2) (as *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 41, p. 92, para 12(1));

(3) to rule that the specific name *vernum* Macquart, 1826, as published in the binomen *Simulium vernum*, be interpreted by reference to the specimens described and figured by Davies in 1966 and 1968;

(4) to place *Cnetha* Enderlein, 1921 (gender: feminine), type species by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Simulium vernum* Macquart, 1826, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(5) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *latipes* Meigen, 1804, as published in the binomen *Atractocera latipes*, as interpreted by reference to the holotype identified by Crosskey & Davies, 1972;

(b) *vernum* Macquart, 1826, as published in the binomen *Simulium vernum*, as interpreted by reference to the specimens described and figured by Davies in 1966 and 1968 (specific name of type species of *Cnetha* Enderlein, 1921 and *Pseudonevermannia* Baranov, 1926).

(6) to place *Pseudonevermannia* Baranov, 1926 (a junior objective synonym of *Caetha* Enderlein 1921 through the action taken under the plenary powers in (1) above) on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BARANOV, N. 1926. Eine neue Simuliiden-Art und einige Bemerkungen über das System der Simuliiden. *Neue Beitr. syst. Insektenk.* vol. 3, pp. 161–164.

———1927. Guide for the identification of simuliid pupae [In Serbian]. *Glasn. cent. hig. Zav., Beogr.* vol. 2(4), pp. 91–93.

———1935. K poznavanju golubačke mušice II [Croatian = Contribution to knowledge of the Golubatz fly II]. *Vet. Arh.* vol. 5 (2–3), pp. 58–140.

———1936. K poznavanju golubačke mušice III [Croatian = Contribution to knowledge of the Golubatz fly III]. *Vet. Arh.* vol. 6 (3–4), pp. 137–220.

CROSSKEY, R. W. 1969. A re-classification of the Simuliidae (Diptera) of Africa and its islands. *Bull. Br. Mus. (nat. Hist.)* (Entomol.), Suppl. vol. 14, pp. 1–195.

———1981. Geographical distribution of Simuliidae. Pp. 57–68 *in* Laird, M. (Ed.), *Blackflies: the future for biological methods in integrated control.* xii + 399 pp. Academic Press, London etc.

——— & DAVIES, L. 1972. The identities of *Simulium lineatum* (Meigen), *S. latipes* (Meigen) and *S. vernum* Macquart (Diptera: Simuliidae). *Entomologist's Gaz.* vol. 23, pp. 249–258.

CUPP, E. W. & GORDON, A. E. (eds.). 1983. Notes on the systematics, distribution, and bionomics of black flies (Diptera: Simuliidae) in the northeastern United States. *Search: Agriculture,* No. 25, 75 pp.

DAVIES, L. 1966. The taxonomy of British black-flies (Diptera: Simuliidae). *Trans. r. entomol. Soc. Lond.* vol. 118, pp. 413–511.

———1968. A key to the British species of Simuliidae (Diptera) in the larval, pupal and adult stages. *Freshwat. biol. Assoc. scient. Publ.* No. 24, 126 pp.

EDWARDS, F. W. 1915. On the British species of *Simulium*—I. The adults. *Bull. entomol. Res.* vol. 6, pp. 23–42.

———1920. On the British species of *Simulium*—II. The early stages; with corrections and additions to Part I. *Bull. entomol. Res.* vol. 11, pp. 211–246.

———1931. *Diptera of Patagonia and South Chile. Part II. Nematocera (excluding crane-flies and Mycetophilidae)*. 331 pp. British Museum (Natural History), London.

ENDERLEIN, G. 1921a. Das System der Kriebelmücken (Simuliidae). *Dt. tierärztl. Wochenschrift* vol. 29, pp. 197–200.

———1921b. Die systematische Gliederung der Simuliiden. *Zool. Anz.* vol. 53, pp. 43–46.

———1925. Weitere Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Simuliiden und ihrer Verbreitung. *Zool. Anz.* vol. 62, pp. 201–211.

———1930. Der heutige Stand der Klassifikation der Simuliiden. *Arch. klassif. phylogen. Entomol.* vol. 1, pp. 77–97.

ERPELDING, G. (in press). First record of *Simulium (Helichiella) latipes* (Meigen, 1804) in South-West Germany (Diptera: Simuliidae). *Entomol. Generalis*, vol. 10.

RIVOSECCHI, L. & CARDINALI, R. 1975. Contributo alla conoscenza dei simulidi italiani. XXIII. Nuovi dati tassonomici. *Riv. Parassitol.* vol. 36, pp. 55–78.

ROTHFELS, K. & GOLINI, V. I. 1983. The polytene chromosomes of species of *Eusimulium (Hellichiella)* (Diptera: Simuliidae). *Can. J. Zool.* vol. 61, pp. 1220–1231.

RUBTSOV, I. A. 1940. Blackflies (fam. Simuliidae). *Fauna SSSR* vol. 6(6), 533 pp. (In Russian).

———1962. Simuliidae (Melusinidae) [part]. *Fliegen palaearkt. Reg.* 14, pp. 257–304. (In German).

———1963. Simuliidae (Melusinidae) [part]. *Fliegen palaearkt. Reg.* 14, pp. 529–560. (in German).

———1974. On the evolution, phylogeny and classification of blackflies (Simuliidae: Diptera). *Trudy zool. Inst. Leningr.* vol. 53, pp. 230–282. (In Russian).

——— & YANKOVSKY, A. V. 1982. New genera and subgenera of blackflies (Diptera, Simuliidae). *Entomol. Obozr.* vol. 61, pp. 183–187. (In Russian: English transl. in *Entomol. Rev., Washington.* vol. 61, pp. 176–181).

——— & ———1984. Key to the genera of Palaearctic blackflies. *Opredeliteli po Faune SSSR*, vol. 142; pp. 1–175 (In Russian).

SMART, J. 1945. The classification of the Simuliidae (Diptera). *Trans. r. entomol. Soc. Lond.* vol. 95, pp. 463–532.

STONE, A. 1963. An annotated list of the genus-group names in the family Simuliidae (Diptera). *U.S. Dept. Agric. Tech. Bull.* No. 1284, 28 pp.

VARGAS, L., MARTÍNEZ PALACIOS, A. & DÍAZ NÁJERA, A. Simúlidos de México. Datos sobre sistemática y morfologia. Descripción de nuevos subgéneros y especies. *Revta Inst. Salubr. Enferm. trop., Méx.* vol. 7, pp. 101–192.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSAL TO AMEND ARTICLE 70 OF THE CODE Z.N.(S.)2477

(see vol. 41, p. 156)

(1) By J. R. Vockeroth (*Biosystematics Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada*)

I wish to support the amendment concerning misidentified type species proposed by Sabrosky. The Secretary has pointed out (p. 158) that the proposal conflicts with Articles 67e and 69a(i) of the third edition of the Code. I would suggest, therefore, that these articles be amended to remove this conflict. The wording could perhaps be as follows:

Article 67e. Add at end 'except in the case of misidentified type species, when the provisions of Article 70b will allow a species other than an orginally included nominal species to be fixed as the type species.'

Article 69a(i). Add after '[Art. 70c]' 'except in the case of misidentified type species, when the provisions of Article 70b will allow a species other than an originally included nominal species to be fixed as the type species.'

(2) By K. G. A. Hamilton (*Biosystematics Research Institute, Agriculture Canada, Ottawa, Ontario K1A OC6, Canada*)

This amendment is long overdue; it seeks to provide stability by adhering to the original author's intent in describing a genus-group name. The Secretary's comments at the end of the article do not invalidate Sabrosky's provisions, because (a) the misidentified species *is* originally included, even though the nominal species may not be, and (b) subsequent naming of the type species should no more invalidate a genus-group name than the subsequent naming of a genus-group name would invalidate a species-group name (Article 17(3)).

OPINION 1298
TYROPHAGUS OUDEMANS, 1924 (ACARINA): CLARIFICATION OF NAME OF TYPE SPECIES AND CONSERVATION

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, the specific name *dimidiatus* Hermann, 1804, as published in the binomen *Acarus dimidiatus*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The generic name *Tyrophagus* Oudemans, 1924 (gender: masculine), type species, by original designation, *Acarus putrescentiae* Schrank, 1781, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2236.

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *putrescentiae* Schrank, 1781, as published in the binomen *Acarus putrescentiae* (specific name of type species of *Tyrophagus* Oudemans, 1924) as interpreted by the neotype designated by Robertson, 1959 (Name Number 2929);
(b) *longior* Gervais, 1844, as published in the binomen *Tyroglyphus longior*, and as interpreted by the neotype designated by Robertson, 1959 (Name Number 2930).

(4) The family-group name TYROPHAGIDAE Oudemans, 1924 (type genus *Tyrophagus* Oudemans, 1924) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 565.

(5) The specific name *dimidiatus* Hermann, 1804, as published in the binomen *Acarus dimidiatus*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1139.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1450

An application for the specific name *dimidiatus* Hermann, 1804, as published in the binomen *Acarus dimidiatus*, to be declared a nomen dubium was first received from Dr Phyllis L. Robertson (now of the *University of New South Wales*) on 18 February 1960. For reasons that cannot now be known this was not then published. A revised application was eventually sent to the printer on 12 August 1980 and published on 30 April 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 125–129. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general periodicals, eight entomological periodicals and one acarological periodical. No comment was received prior to the voting.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)23 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 128–129. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — fifteen (15) received in the following order: Melville, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Heppell (in part), Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Votes — two (2): Holthuis, Heppell (in part).

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Willink.

Heppell voted for all the proposals except the one to place the family-group name TYROPHAGIDAE on the Official List. He said: 'There is no discussion of the family name in the application and there is no requirement for the Commission to consider its validity. In a case where there have been no comments from zoologists it seems to me wrong to take any action concerning a family name when there are no nomenclatural reasons for so doing.'

Holthuis commented: 'My negative vote concerns the use of the plenary powers to suppress *Acarus dimidiatus* Hermann, 1804. If a neotype can be chosen for the dubious species *A. putrescentiae*, why not for *A. dimidiatus*? The choice of neotype could either make *A. dimidiatus* a junior synonym (when it can be eliminated) or link it to a specimen of the taxon for which it is not used. The applicant gives very little information on present usage of the name. In Hughes, 1961, The Mites of Stored Food, *Tech. Bull. 9, Min. Ag. Fish. Food, London*) both *Tyrophagus dimidiatus* (Hermann) and *T. longior* (Gervais) are recognised. One solution would be to choose as neotype a specimen of the species for which Hughes used the name. In any case it seems better to postpone any action in connexion with the name until acarologists decide which species would best bear the name. It is regrettable that no comments have been received from acarologists. Dr L. van der Hammen, the acarologist at the Leiden Museum, though not a specialist in this group, said that he could see no need to suppress the name so long as there are different opinions as to its identity.'

Dr Robertson replied as follows: 'It is important to bear in mind not only that Oudemans erected the genus *Tyrophagus*, but also that he was the first to refer *A. dimidiatus* Hermann to it. Thus action to deal with *dimidiatus* should most reasonably be approached in terms of the concept held by Oudemans.

'It is suggested that a neotype be designated for *dimidiatus*. But Oudemans used the name for the species that currently has worldwide acceptance as *Tyrophagus longior* (Gervais, 1844), one of the most widespread and best known of the stored-product *Tyrophagus* species. A neotype for *dimidiatus* from Oudemans' material would thus lead to the relegation of *longior* as a junior synonym and so regenerate, rather than resolve, the many years of nomenclatural confusion in *Tyrophagus*.

'It is further suggested that a neotype be designated from Mrs Hughes' 1961 material. But this would be to ignore the fact that that material is in strong disagreement with Hermann's original description: it lacks chelicerae of a type "which are not articulated at all as in other mites"; its hysterosoma is not spherical, it is not divided by a transverse suture, and it does not have yellowish-green and white coloration. Moreover, it has not been found, either by Mrs Hughes or apparently by other present-day acarologists, in Hermann's original habitat — moss.

'It may be added that Hermann's description appears to be applicable more to one of the primitive moss mites than to a *Tyrophagus*. That is, it may have been an oribatid — a member, say, of Tragardh's (1932) Palaeacariformes, currently Palaeacaroidea, a group not recognised at the time of Oudemans' 1924 work.

'It is suggested that designating a neotype for *putrescentiae* (the type species of *Tyrophagus*) itself furnishes grounds for doing the same for *dimidiatus*. But the situations regarding the two are completely different. Morphological features clearly defined by Hermann concerning the form of the chelicerae, and the shape, suturing and coloration of the hysterosoma, debar *dimidiatus* from being accepted as a species of *Tyrophagus*. But there are no such characters debarring *putrescentiae* from such acceptance. Further, Oudemans was unable to find a *Tyrophagus* in the habitat — moss — of Hermann's species, while he did find his *putrescentiae* in Schrank's original habitat.

'It should be emphasised that the *Tyrophagus* problem concerning *dimidiatus* is not centred essentially on acarologists being unable to agree between themselves on which species should bear the name. Rather it is agreed that *dimidiatus* should not have been introduced into the genus in the first place (see Johnston & Bruce, 1965, *Ohio Agric. R & D Center, Research Bull. 977*). Hermann originally described characters that exclude it from recognition as any species of *Tyrophagus* at all.

'Any uncertainty as to the *Tyrophagus* species to which the name *dimidiatus* might conceivably be applied has been a personal problem for each individual acarologist who attempted to use the name. For example, Oudemans himself demonstrated uncertainty when he first used *dimidiatus* for the species that he later called *australasiae*, and then by transferring it to the species now accepted as *longior*. In 1948 Mrs Hughes used *tenuiclavus* for the species she accepted as *longior* in 1961; in 1957 she used *dimidiatus* for this species, but transferred that name to a completely different species in 1961. None of these determinations appears to be related in any way to the characteristics of the species originally described by Hermann.

'Such uncertainty and doubt in the views of individual acarologists lends support to the application to suppress *dimidiatus* as a threat to stability of nomenclature. This would formalise the results of the intensive basic research already done on *Tyrophagus* by a number of workers and which is unlikely to be repeated. It would bring to *Tyrophagus* nomenclature a much-needed stability in the long term, facilitating the continuing build-up of knowledge of this worldwide but extremely difficult genus.' Dr Holthuis later withdrew his objection. Dr Robertson's application was then supported by Professor J. G. Rodriguez (*University of Kentucky College of Agriculture*).

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

dimidiatus, Acarus, Hermann, 1804, *Mem. Apter.*, p. 85, pl. 6, fig. 4
longior, Tyroglyphus, Gervais, 1844, *Hist. nat. Ins.* (Aptères), vol. 3, p. 262, pl. 35, fig. 5
putrescentiae, Acarus, Schrank, 1781, *Enum. Ins. Austriae indig.*, p. 521
TYROPHAGIDAE Oudemans, 1924, *Entomol. Ber. Amsterdam*, vol. 6, pp. 203, 207
Tyrophagus Oudemans, 1924, *Entomol. Ber. Amsterdam*, vol. 6, p. 250.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)23 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1298.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
4 October 1984

OPINION 1299

ATHYREUS MACLEAY, 1819 AND *GLYPTUS* BRULLE, 1835 (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers the generic name *Glyptus* Hoffmannsegg, 1818 and all uses of that name prior to the publication of *Glyptus* Brullé, 1835 are hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Athyreus* Macleay, 1819 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Howden & Martinez, 1963, *Athyreus bifurcatus* Macleay, 1819 (Name Number 2237);

(b) *Glyptus* Brullé, 1835 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Glyptus sculptilis* Brullé, 1835 (Name Number 2238).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *bifurcatus* Macleay, 1819, as published in the binomen *Athyreus bifurcatus* (specific name of type species of *Athyreus* Macleay, 1819 (Name Number 2931);

(b) *sculptilis* Brullé, 1835, as published in the binomen *Glyptus sculptilis* (specific name of type species of *Glyptus* Brullé, 1835 (Name Number 2932).

(4) The generic name *Glyptus* Hoffmannsegg, 1818, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2152.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1583

An application from Professor H. F. Howden (now of *Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada*) for the suppression of *Glyptus* Hoffmannsegg, 1818 was first received on 26 November 1962. As it was presented in terms of Article 23b then in force, no action was taken on it then. The case was reopened in 1979 and a revised application was sent to the printer on 15 April 1980 and published on 25 September 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 191–192. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general periodicals and seven entomological periodicals. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)24 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 192. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Heppell, Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Votes — none (0).

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Willink.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Athyreus Macleay, 1819, *Horae entomol.*, vol. 1 (1), p. 123
bifurcatus, Athyreus, Macleay, 1819, *Horae entomol.*, vol. 1 (1), p. 124
Glyptus Hoffmannsegg, 1818, *Wiedemann's Zool. Mag.*, vol. 1 (2), p. 85
Glyptus Brullé, 1835, *Hist. nat. Ins.*, vol. 5, Coleoptera II, p. 83
sculptilis, Glyptus, Brullé, 1835, *Hist. nat. Ins.*, vol. 5, Coleoptera II, p. 84.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)24 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1299.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
4 October 1984

OPINION 1300
TEIIDAE GRAY, 1827 GIVEN NOMENCLATURAL PRECEDENCE OVER AMEIVIDAE FITZINGER, 1826 (REPTILIA, SAURIA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the family-group name TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 (type genus *Teius* Merrem, 1820) is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the family-group name AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826 (type genus *Ameiva* Meyer, 1795) whenever the two names are applied to the same taxon.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Teius* Merrem, 1820 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Burt & Burt, 1933, *Teius viridis* Merrem, 1820 (Name Number 2239);

(b) *Tupinambis* Daudin, 1802 (gender: masculine), type species, by absolute tautonymy through *Temapara tupinambis* Ray, 1693, *Tupinambis monitor* Daudin, 1802 (Name Number 2240);

(c) *Ameiva* Meyer, 1795 (gender: feminine) type species, by monotypy, *Ameiva americana* Meyer, 1795 (Name Number 2241).

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *teyou* Daudin, 1802, as published in the binomen *Lacerta teyou* (specific name of type species of *Teius* Merrem, 1820) (Name Number 2933);

(b) *teguixin* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Lacerta teguixin* (the valid specific name at the time of this ruling for the type species of *Tupinambis* Daudin, 1802 (Name Number 2934);

(c) *ameiva* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Lacerta ameiva* (the valid specific name at the time of this ruling for the type species of *Ameiva* Meyer, 1795 (Name Number 2935).

(4) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 (type genus *Teius* Merrem, 1820) with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826 (type genus *Ameiva* Meyer, 1795) whenever the two names are applied to the same taxon (Name Number 566);

(b) AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826 (type genus *Ameiva* Meyer, 1795) with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 (type genus *Teius* Merrem, 1820) whenever the two names are applied to the same taxon (Name Number 567).

(5) The unavailable family-group name TUPINAMBIDAE Gray, 1825 is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 502.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1920

An application for the conservation of the family-group name TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 was first received from Dr William Presch (now of *California State University, Fullerton, California*) on 20 February 1970. In the circumstances of the time it was overlooked. In February 1980 a revised draft was prepared by the Secretariat and sent to Dr Presch for examination. His amended draft was sent to the printer on 12 August 1980 and published on 30 July 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 194–195. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and three herpetological serials.

In a comment published on 30 September 1982 in vol. 39, pp. 157–158, Professor H. M. Smith, Mrs R. B. Smith and Dr David Chiszar showed that TUPINAMBIDAE Gray, 1825 was in fact an unavailable name and therefore did not threaten the stability of TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 as Dr Presch had thought. On the other hand, they did show that the stability of TEIIDAE was threatened by AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826 and accordingly asked that TEIIDAE be given nomenclatural precedence over that name. Dr Presch fully accepted this comment.

In a further comment published on 30 December 1983 in vol. 40, pp. 196–197, Mr Andrew Stimson corrected certain factual errors concerning the respective type species of *Teius* Merrem, 1820 and *Tupinambis* Daudin, 1802. No other comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)25 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 157–158, taking into account the corrections of fact published in vol. 40, pp. 196–197. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss, Heppell

Negative Votes — one (1): Dupuis.

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Cogger, Lehtinen and Willink.

On 13 July 1984 Monsieur Dupuis wrote to the Secretary in the following terms: 'Je suis dans l'obligation morale, et sans doute juridique, de vous demander de suspendre le vote relatif à la conservation de TEIIDAE.'

'Le dernier commentaire publié relatif à ce cas se trouve dans *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40(4) paru le 30 décembre 1983 et j'estime qu'ouvrir le vote le 13 juin 1984 ne respecte pas l'esprit de la règle des six mois.'

'De plus, Lescure et Cei ont soumis à la Commission une proposition — malheureusement encore inédite — pour la conservation de *Ameiva oculata* d'Orbigny & Bibron, 1837, qui, selon ces mêmes auteurs, est le seul nom valide pour *Teius teyou* des auteurs, non Daudin. Dans ce même manuscrit Lescure & Cei estiment nécessaire de désigner un néotype pour *Lacerta teyou* Daudin. Or, la proposition du Dr Presch suggérant de placer *Teius teyou* (Daudin) sur la Liste Officielle, il vaudrait mieux que ce nom y soit défini sans ambiguité. A mon avis il serait plus sage d'attendre les commentaires définitifs de nos collègues — et en particulier la publication de leur requête précitée — que de voter dans la précipitation. Si vous ne suivez pas mon point de vue, je vous demande de considérer que je vote contre la proposition du Dr Presch.'

On receipt of Monsieur Dupuis' comment I consulted Mr Andrew Stimson (*British Museum (Natural History) London*). He was inclined to agree with Monsieur Dupuis, but pointed out (a) that the nominal type species of *Teius* Merrem, 1820 must be *Lacerta teyou* Daudin, irrespective of the biological species involved; (b) that that is the only originally included nominal species remaining in the genus; (c) that the two biological species remaining in the genus were for long considered conspecific, so that it is unlikely they will ever be placed in different genera. Having regard to the length of time that had elapsed since the first receipt of Dr Presch's application, therefore, I judged it best to publish the decision of the Commission reached in the present case. In reply to Monsieur Dupuis I pointed out that the six months' rule applied only to cases involving the use of the plenary powers. The most recent comment mentioned by him did not involve any unadvertised use of those powers, so that the six months' rule was not relevant. I also pointed out that the publication of the application by MM. Lescure and Cei depended upon my receiving answers to questions that are still open.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Ameiva Meyer, 1795, *Syn. Rept.* (Göttingen), p. 31
ameiva, Lacerta, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 202
AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826, *Neue Class. Rept.*, p. 21
teguixin, Lacerta, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 208

TEIIDAE Gray, 1827, *Phil. Mag.* (2) vol. 1, p. 53
Teius Merrem, 1820, *Tent. Syst. Amph.*, pp. 13, 60
teyou, Lacerta, Daudin, 1802, Sonnini's Buffon, *Hist. nat. Rept.*, vol. 3, p. 195
TUPINAMBIDAE Gray, 1825, *Ann. Philos.* vol. 26 (N.S. vol. 10), p. 199
Tupinambis Daudin, 1802, Sonnini's Buffon, *Hist. nat. Rept.*, vol. 3, p. 5.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)25 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1300.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
18 October 1984

OPINION 1301
ARTEMIA LEACH, 1819 (CRUSTACEA, BRANCHIOPODA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) the generic name *Artemesia* Latreille, 1816 is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

(b) the generic name *Artemisus* Lamarck, 1818 is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

(c) the generic name *Artemia* Leach, 1819 is hereby given nomenclatural precedence over *Eulimene* Latreille, 1816, whenever the two names are regarded as synonyms.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Artemia* Leach, 1819 (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent designation by Lucas, 1840, *Cancer salinus* Linnaeus, 1758, with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over *Eulimene* Latreille, 1816, whenever the two names are regarded as synonyms (Name Number 2242);

(b) *Eulimene* Latreille, 1816 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Eulimene albida* Latreille, 1816, with an endorsement that it is not to have priority over *Artemia* Leach, 1819, whenever the two names are regarded as synonyms (Name Number 2243).

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *salinus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Cancer salinus* (specific name of the type species of *Artemia* Leach, 1819) (Name Number 2936);

(b) *albida* Latreille, 1816, as published in the binomen *Eulimene albida* (specific name of the type species of *Eulimene* Latreille, 1817) (Name Number 2937).

(4) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Artemisia* Latreille, 1816, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above (Name Number 2153);

(b) *Artemisus* Lamarck, 1818, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above (Name Number 2154).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1984

An application by Professor J. H. Lochhead (*Department of Zoology, University of Vermont, U.S.A.*) for the resolution of certain nomenclatural problems relating to *Artemia* Leach was first received on 18 October 1971. After extensive correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printer on 15 April 1980 and published on 4 December 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 223–227. Public notice of the possible use of plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to nine general periodicals and one crustacean periodical. The application was supported by Dr L. B. Holthuis (*Rikjsmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden*) who also clarified two points. Mathews (1911, *Novitates Zoologicae*, vol. 18(1), p. 18) noted that the four volumes of the first edition of Cuvier's *Règne Animal* were published on 7 December 1816, not in 1817 as mentioned on the title page. The date of *Artemisia* Latreille is thus 1816 (in *Règne Anim.* (ed. 1) vol. 3, p. 68). The first type designation for the genus *Artemia* Leach that is known is by Lucas, 1840 (*Histoire naturelle des Crustacés, des Arachnides et des Myriapodes*, p. 289). Dr Lochhead accepted Dr Holthuis's points. No other comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)26 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 226. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — seventeen (17) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Heppell, Dupuis, Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Votes — none (0).

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No voting papers were returned by Cogger, Lehtinen and Willink.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

albida Latreille, 1816 *in* Cuvier, *Le Règne Animal* (ed. 1) vol. 3, p. 68
Artemia Leach, 1819, Entomostraca *in Dict. Sci. Nat.* vol. 14, p. 543
Artemisia Latreille, 1816, *in* Cuvier, *Le Règne Animal*, (ed. 1) vol. 3, p. 68
Artemisus Lamarck, 1818, *Histoire naturelle des animaux sans vertèbres*, vol. 5, p. 135
Eulimene Latreille, 1816 *in* Cuvier, *Le Règne Animal* (ed. 1) vol. 3, p. 68
salinus Linnaeus, 1758, *Systema Naturae*, (ed. 10) vol. 1, p. 634.

The following is the original reference to a type species designation accepted in the ruling given in the present Opinion: of *Cancer salinus* Linnaeus, 1758 as type species of *Artemia* Leach, 1819, by Lucas, P. H., 1840, *Histoire naturelle des Crustacés, des Arachnides et des Myriapodes*, p. 289.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)26 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1301.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
18 October 1984

OPINION 1302
NABIS CAPSIFORMIS GERMAR, [1838[(INSECTA, HETEROPTERA, NABIDAE): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, the specific name *angustus* Spinola, 1837, as published in the binomen *Nabis angusts*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *capsiformis* Germar, [1838], as published in the binomen *Nabis capsiformis*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2938.

(3) The specific name *angustus* Spinola, 1837, as published in the binomen *Nabis angustus*, and as suppressed by use of the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1140.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2147

An application for the use of plenary powers to suppress the specific name *angustus* Spinola, 1837, was first received from Dr I. M. Kerzhner (*Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Leningrad, USSR*) on 8 September 1975. After much correspondence concerning the dating of the Germar work, a revised application was sent to the printer on 12 August 1980 and published on 30 July 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 38, pp. 205–207. Public notice of the possible use of plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to six general serials and nine specialist serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)29 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, col. 38, p. 206. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Heppell, Dupuis, Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Votes — one (1); Hahn.

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Cogger, Lehtinen and Willink.

Dupuis commented: 'Une étude de C. M. G. von Hayek (*Arch. Nat. Hist.*, 11(2), 1983: 207–208) confirme bien que les livralsons 25–28 ne peuvent pas appartenir au tome IV (quatre) de la revue de Silberman et sont nécessairement postérieures à juin 1838. La date établie par Kerzhner pour *Nabis capsiformis* me parait dont correcte.'

Hahn commented: '*Nabis angustus* should be suppressed only if competing with *N. capsiformis,* but not completely as wished by Dr Kerzhner.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

capsiormis, Nabis, Germar, [1838], *Silbermann's Rev. entomol.* t. 5, p. 132
angustus, Nabis, Spinola, 1837, *Essai sur les genres d'insectes appartenants à l'ordre des Hémiptères* . . . Gènes, p. 107.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (84)29 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1302.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
23 October 1984

OPINION 1303

COCCUS LINNAEUS, 1758 AND *PARTHENOLECANIUM* ŠULC, 1908 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA, HOMOPTERA): TYPE SPECIES DESIGNATED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) the specific name *coryli* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Coccus coryli*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

(b) all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Coccus* Linnaeus, 1758, are hereby set aside and *Coccus hesperidum* Linnaeus, 1758 is hereby designated as type species of that genus;

(c) all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Parthenolecanium* Šulc, 1908, are hereby set aside and *Lecanium corni* Bouché, 1844, is hereby designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Coccus* Linnaeus, 1758 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, *Coccus hesperidum* Linnaeus, 1758 (Name Number 2244);

(b) *Eulecanium* Cockerell, 1893 (gender: neuter), type species, by original designation, *Coccus tiliae* Linnaeus, 1758 (Name Number 2245);

(c) *Parthenolecanium* Šulc, 1908 (gender: neuter), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(c) above, *Lecanium corni* Bouché, 1844 (Name Number 2246).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *hesperidum* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Coccus hesperidum* (specific name of type species of *Coccus* Linnaeus, 1758) (Name Number 2939);

(b) *tiliae* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Coccus tiliae* (specific name of type species of *Eulecanium* Cockerell, 1893) (Name Number 2940);

(c) *corni* Bouché, 1844, as published in the binomen *Lecanium corni* (specific name of *Parthenolecanium* Šulc, 1908) (Name Number 2941).

(4) The generic name *Lecanium* Burmeister, 1835 (a junior objective synonym of *Coccus* Linnaeus, 1758) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2155).

(5) The specific name *coryli* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Coccus coryli*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1141.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2125

An application for the designation of type species for the scale insect genera *Coccus* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Parthenolecanium* Šulc, 1908 was first received from Dr Evelyna Danzig and Dr I. Kerzhner (*Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad*) on 21 April 1975. After an exchange of correspondence it was sent to the printer on 12 August 1980 and published on 30 April 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 147–152. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and eight entomological serials.

On 9 December 1981 a comment was received from Dr Halina Komosińska and Dr M. Mroczkowski (*Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Warsaw*). They objected to the rejection of *Lecanium* Burmeister, 1835 and asked that the plenary powers be used to designate *Lecanium corni* Bouché, 1844, as type species of that genus, thus rendering *Parthenolecanium* Šulc, 1908, a junior objective synonym. Their arguments from usage were rebutted by Danzig & Kerzhner, who demonstrated the progressive displacement of *Lecanium* by *Eulecanium* and *Parthenolecanium*. These comments were published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 147–152, on 30 April 1981. No other comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)27 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 150–151. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — fourteen (14) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Binder, Starobogatov, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Sabrosky, Corliss, Heppell

Negative Vote — one (1); Mroczkowski.

Holthuis abstained from voting. Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Brinck, Dupuis, Cogger, Lehtinen and Willink.

Holthuis and Mroczkowski complained that no choice had been offered between the Danzig/Kerzhner proposals and the Komosińska/Mroczkowski proposals. The failure to offer this choice on the voting paper is regretted.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and Official Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Coccus Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 455
corni, Lecanium, Bouché, 1844, *Entomol. Z. Stettin,* Jahrg. 5(8), p. 298
coryli, Coccus, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 456
Eulecanium Cockerell, 1893, *Trans. amer. entomol. Soc.,* vol. 20, p. 54
Lecanium Burmeister, 1835, *Handb. Entomol.,* vol. 2, p. 69
hesperidum, Coccus, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 455
Parthenolecanium Šulc, 1908, *Entomol. mon. Mag.,* vol. 44, p. 36
tiliae, Coccus, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 456

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)27 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1303.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
23 October 1984

OPINION 1304

MELITHAEA MILNE EDWARDS & HAIME, 1857 AND *ISIS OCHRACEA* LINNAEUS, 1758 (COELENTERATA, ANTHOZOA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) It is hereby ruled that *Melithaea* Milne Edwards & Haime, 1857, is an available name and is to be treated as an unjustified emendation of *Melitea* Lamouroux, 1812;

(b) the spelling *ochracea* Linnaeus, 1767 in the binomen *Isis ochracea* is to be treated as a justified emendation of *Isis ocracea* Linnaeus, 1758.

(2) The generic name *Melithaea* Milne Edwards & Haime, 1857 (gender: feminine), made available under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above, type species, through *Melitea* Lamouroux, 1812, *Isis ochracea* Linnaeus, 1758, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2247.

(3) The specific name *ochracea* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Isis ochracea* (ruled under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above to be a justified emendation of *ocracea* Linnaeus, 1758) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2942.

(4) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Melitea* Lamouroux, 1812, a junior homonym of *Melitea* Peron & Lesueur, 1810 (Name Number 2156);

(b) *Melitodes* Verrill, 1864, a junior objective synonym of *Melithaea* Milne Edwards & Haime, 1857 (Name Number 2157).

(5) The spelling *ocracea* Linnaeus, 1758, as ruled under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above to be an incorrect original spelling of *Isis ochracea* Linnaeus, 1758, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1142.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2150

An application concerning *Melithaea ochracea* (Linnaeus, 1758) was first received from Dr Katherine Muzik and Dr F. M. Bayer (then both of *University of Miami*) on 25 September 1975. After an exchange of correspondence it was sent to the printer on 15 April 1980 and published on 8 December 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 228–232. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and to two marine biological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)30 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 230. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — fifteen (15) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Heppell, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Vote — one (1) Binder.

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Cogger, Dupuis and Lehtinen.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for names placed on Official Lists and Official Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Melitea Lamouroux, 1812, *Nouv. Bull. Soc. philom. Paris,* vol. 3(63), 6, p. 188
Melithaea Milne Edwards & Haime, 1857, *Histoire naturelle des coralliaires ou polypes proprement dits*, p. 199
Melitodes Verrill, 1864, *Bull. Mus. comp. Zool.,* vol. 1, p. 38
ochracea, Isis, Linnaeus, 1767, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 12, vol. 1(2), p. 1287
ocracea, Isis, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 799.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)30 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1304.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
23 October 1984

OPINION 1305
BAPTA CANDIDARIA LEECH, 1897 IS THE TYPE SPECIES OF *LAMPROCABERA* INOUE, 1958 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Lamprocabera* Inoue, 1958, are hereby set aside and *Bapta candidaria* Leech, 1897 is hereby designated as the type species.

(2) The generic name *Lamprocabera* Inoue, 1958 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Bapta candidaria* Leech, 1897, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2248.

(3) The specific name *candidaria* Leech, 1897, as published in the binomen *Bapta candidaria* (specific name of type species of *Lamprocabera* Inoue, 1958) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2943.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2160

An application for the use of the plenary powers to vary the originally designated nominal type species of *Lamprocabera* Inoue, 1958 was first received from Professor H. Inoue (*Otsuma Women's University, Tokyo*) on 31 December 1975. An improved draft was sent to the printer on 15 April 1980 and published on 25 September 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 163–164. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and eight entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)31 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 164. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Heppell, Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Votes — none (0).

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Willink.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

candidaria, Bapta, Leech, 1897, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (6) vol. 19, p. 198
Lamprocabera Inoue, 1958, *Tinea* vol. 4, p. 253.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)31 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1305.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
24 October 1984

OPINION 1306

LEDELLA BUSHAE WARÉN, 1978 IS THE TYPE SPECIES OF *LEDELLA* VERRILL & BUSH, 1897 (MOLLUSCA, BIVALVIA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Ledella* Verrill & Bush, 1897 are hereby set aside and *Ledella bushae* Warén, 1978 is hereby designated as the type species of that genus.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Ledella* Verrill & Bush, 1897 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Ledella bushae* Warén, 1978 (Name Number 2249);

(b) *Yoldiella* Verrill & Bush, 1897 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Yoldia lucida* Lovén, 1896 (Name Number 2250).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *bushae* Warén, 1978, as published in the binomen *Ledella bushae* (specific name of type species of *Ledella* Verrill & Bush, 1897) (Name Number 2944);

(b) *lucida* Lovén, 1846, as published in the binomen *Yoldia lucida* (specific name of type species of *Yoldiella* Verrill & Bush, 1897) (Name Number 2945).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2238

An application for the use of the plenary powers to designate a type species for the nominal genus *Ledella* Verrill & Bush, 1897, was first received from Dr Anders Warén (*University of Göteborg, Sweden*) on 17 November 1977. A revised version was submitted on 20 April 1980, sent to the printer on 12 August 1980 and published on 30 April 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 134–137. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and three malacological serials. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)32 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, p. 136. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order:

Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Binder, Starobogatov, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss, Sabrosky, Heppell

Negative Votes — none (0).

Alvarado, Bernardi, Bayer, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Willink.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

bushae, Ledella, Warén, 1978, *Sarsia*, vol. 63, pp. 213–214
Ledella Verrill & Bush, 1897, *Amer. J. Sci.* vol. 3, p. 54
lucida, Yoldia Lovén, 1846, *Ofvers. k. Vetenskaps Akad. Förh.* vol. 3 (6), p. 188
Yoldiella Verrill & Bush, 1897, *Amer. J. Sci.* vol. 3, p. 55.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)32 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1306.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
25 October 1984

OPINION 1307

PTINELLA MOTSCHULSKY, 1844 AND *NEPHANES* THOMSON, 1859 (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Ptinella* Motschulsky, 1844 are hereby set aside and *Ptilium apterum* Guérin-Méneville, 1839 is hereby designated as type species of that genus;

(b) the generic name *Titan* Matthews, 1858 is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Ptinella* Motschulsky, 1844 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above, *Ptilium apterum* Guérin-Méneville, 1839 (Name Number 2251);

(b) *Nephanes* Thomson, 1859 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Trichopteryx abbreviatella* Heer, 1841 (Name Number 2252).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with Name Numbers specified:

(a) *apterum* Guérin-Méneville, 1839, as published in the binomen *Ptilium apterum* (specific name of type species of *Ptinella* Motschulsky, 1844) (Name Number 2946);

(b) *titan* Newman, 1834, as published in the binomen *Trichopteryx titan* (the valid name at the date of this ruling for the type species of *Nephanes* Thomson, 1859) (Name Number 2947).

(4) The generic name *Titan* Matthews, 1858, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2158.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N. (S.)2258

An application for the conservation of the generic names *Ptinella* Motschulsky, 1844 and *Nephanes* Thomson, 1859 was first received from Dr Olof Biström (*University Zoological Museum, Helsinki*) on 28 March 1978. After an exchange of correspondence, a revised draft was sent to the printer on 15 April 1980 and published on 25 September 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 169–172. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and seven entomological serials. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)33 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 170. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — fifteen (15) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Heppell, Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Vote (in part): Mroczkowski.

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Willink.

Mroczkowski voted for the proposals concerning *Ptinella* but against those concerning *Nephanes*. He commented: '*Titan* Matthews, 1858 is not a forgotten name. It was used as a valid name in 1978, *Catalogus faunae Poloniae*, part XXIII, Coleoptera, vol. 5, Histeroidea and Staphylinoidea except Staphylinidae, p. 79; and by Gerhardt, 1900, *Z. Entomol* (Breslau), vol. 25, p. 4'. In reply, Dr Biström provided ten references to papers by ten different authors since 1960, all using *Nephanes* for this genus.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

apterum, Ptilium, Guérin-Méneville, 1839, *Dict. pitt. hist. nat. phén. nature,* p. 621
Nephanes Thomson, 1859, *Skand. Coleopt.*, vol. 1, p. 62
Ptinella Motschulsky, 1844, *Bull. Soc. Nat. Moscou,* vol. 17, p. 819
Titan Matthews, 1858, *Zoologist,* vol. 16, p. 6108
titan, Trichopteryx, Newman, 1834, *Entomol. Mag.*, vol. 2, p. 201.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)33 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1307.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
25 October 1984

OPINION 1308

APHIS CALLUNAE THEOBALD, 1915 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the specific name *callunae* Theobald, 1915, as published in the binomen *Aphis callunae*, is to be given precedence over the specific name *betulina* Walker, 1852, as published in the binomen *Aphis betulina*, whenever the two names are held to be synonyms.

(2) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the endorsements and Name Numbers specified:

(a) *callunae* Theobald, 1915, as published in the binomen *Aphis callunae*, with an endorsement that it is to be given precedence over *Aphis betulina* Walker, 1852, whenever the two names are held to be synonyms (Name Number 2948);

(b) *betulina* Walker, 1852, as published in the binomen *Aphis betulina*, with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *Aphis callunae* Theobald, 1915 whenever the two names are held to be synonyms (Name Number 2949).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N. (S.) 2283

An application for the conservation of *Aphis callunae* Theobald, 1915 was first received from Dr H. L. G. Stroyan (*MAFF Plant Pathology Laboratory, Hatching Green, Harpenden, U.K.*) on 26 March 1976. It was held back pending the publication elsewhere of a paper on the rediscovery of Walker's type material of *Aphis betulina* but was sent to the printer on 15 April 1980 and published on 25 September 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 173–175. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and seven entomological serials. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)35 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 175. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Heppell, Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Votes — none (0).

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Willink.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

betulina, Aphis, Walker, 1852, *List Spec. homopt. Ins. Colls brit. Mus.*, vol. 4, p. 1039

callunae, Aphis, Theobald, 1915, *Entomologist*, vol. 48, pp. 260–261.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)35 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1308.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
25 October 1984

OPINION 1309

GEOEMYDA GRAY, 1834, AND *RHINOCLEMMYS* FITZINGER, 1835 (REPTILIA, TESTUDINES): CONSERVED

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers the generic name *Chemelys* Rafinesque, 1832 is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Geoemyda* Gray, 1834 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation, *Testudo spengleri* Gmelin, 1789 (Name Number 2253);

(b) *Rhinoclemmys* Fitzinger, 1835 (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent designation by Lindholm, 1929, *Testudo dorsata* Schoepff, 1801, Name Number 752 on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology, (=*Testudo punctularia* Daudin, 1801. Name Number 1906 on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology) both in Opinion 660 published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 20, pp. 187–190. *Rhinoclemmys* Fitzinger, 1835 is hereby given Name Number 2254.

(3) the specific name *spengleri* Gmelin, 1789, as published in the binomen *Testudo spengleri* (specific name of the type species of *Geoemyda* Gray, 1834) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2950.

(4) the generic name *Chemelys* Rafinesque, 1832 as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2159.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N. (S.)2287

An application for the use of plenary powers to conserve the generic names *Geomyda* Gray, 1834 and *Rhinoclemmys* Fitzinger, 1835 was first received from Professor Hobart Smith (*Department of Environmental, Population and Organismic Biology (DEPOB), University of Colorado, Boulder, U.S.A.*) and Dr Carl H. Ernst (*Department of Biology, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia, U.S.A.*) and Dr Rozella B. Smith (*DEPOB*) on 2 October 1978. After some correspondence, a revised manuscript was sent to the printers on 15 April 1980 and published on 4 December 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 37, pp. 233–239. Public notice of the possible use of plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to six general periodicals and three specialist periodicals. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)36 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 236–237. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes—sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Heppell, Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Votes—none (0).

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No voting papers were returned by Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Willink.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on the Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Chemelys Rafinesque, 1832. *Atl. J. and Friend of Knowl.*, vol. 1, p. 64
Geoemyda Gray, 1834, *Proc. zool. Soc. London.* 1834, p. 100
Rhinoclemmys Fitzinger, 1835, *Ann. Naturhist. Mus. Wien.*, vol. 1, p. 115
spengleri Gmelin, 1789, *in* Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* ed 13, vol. 1. p. 1043.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P. (84)36 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1309.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
26 October 1984

OPINION 1310
EUTERMES EXITIOSUS HILL, 1925 (INSECTA, ISOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *australis* Walker, 1853, as published in the binomen *Termes australis*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *exitiosus* Hill, 1925, as published in the binomen *Eutermes exitiosus*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2951.

(3) The specific name *australis* Walker, 1853, as published in the binomen *Termes australis*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1143.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2290

An application for the conservation of *Eutermes exitiosus* Hill, 1925 was first received from Dr J. A. L. Watson and Dr F. J. Gay (*Division of Entomology, CSIRO, Canberra, Australia*) on 7 November 1978. It was held back pending the publication of a paper on the lectotype of *Termes australis* Walker, 1853, but was sent to the printer on 12 August 1980 and published on 30 April 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 142–146. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and seven entomological serials. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)37 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, p. 144. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — fifteen (15) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Heppell, Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Vote — one (1) Hahn.

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Willink.

Hahn commented: '*Termes australis* should be suppressed only if competing with *E. exitiosus*, not completely.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

australis, Termes, Walker, 1853, *List specs neuropt. Ins. Coll. brit. Mus.*, part 3, p. 525

exitiosus, Eutermes, Hill, 1925, *Proc. roy. Soc. Victoria* N.S. vol. 37, p. 222.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)37 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1310.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
25 October 1984

OPINION 1311
CORISELLA LUNDBLAD, 1928 AND *KRIZOUSACORIXA* HUNGERFORD, 1930 (INSECTA, HETEROPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the generic name *Ahuautlea* de la Llave, 1832 is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Corisella* Lundblad, 1928 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Hungerford, 1948, *Corixia mercenaria* Say, 1832 (Name Number 2255);

(b) *Krizousacorixa* Hungerford, 1930 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Corixa femorata* Guérin-Méneville, 1857 (Name Number 2256).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *mercenaria* Say, 1832, as published in the binomen *Corixia mercenaria* (specific name of type species of *Corisella* Lundblad, 1928) (Name Number 2952);

(b) *femorata* Guérin-Méneville, 1857, as published in the binomen *Corixa femorata* (specific name of type species of *Krizousacorixa* Hungerford, 1930) (Name Number 2953).

(4) The generic name *Ahuautlea* de la Llave, 1832, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2160.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2299

An application for the conservation of *Corisella* Lundblad, 1928 and *Krizousacorixa* Hungerford, 1930 was first received from Dr Antti Jansson (*Zoological Museum, University of Helsinki, Finland*) on 3 April 1979. It was sent to the printer on 12 August 1980 and published on 30 July 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 197–200. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was published in the same part of the *Bulletin* and was sent to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and seven entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)38 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, p. 199. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes—seventeen (17) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Heppell, Dupuis, Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Votes—none (0).

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Cogger, Lehtinen and Willink.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Ahuautlea de la Llave, 1832, *Registro trimestre* No. 1 (3), p. 335
Corisella Lundblad, 1928, *Zool. Anz.*, vol. 79, pp. 148, 158
femorata, Corixa, Guérin-Méneville, 1857, *Moniteur univ.*, no. 330, p. 1298
Krizousacorixa Hungerford, 1930, *Pan-pac. Entomol.*, vol. 7, p. 22
mercenaria, Corixia, Say, 1832, *Descr. new spp. heteropt. Hemipt. N. America,* p. 39.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P. (84)38 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1311.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
25 October 1984

OPINION 1312
HELIOTHIS OCHSENHEIMER, 1816 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): GENDER AND STEM DESIGNATED

RULING. — (1) It is hereby ruled:
(a) that the stem of the generic name *Heliothis* Ochsenheimer, 1816 for the purposes of Article 29 is HELIOTH-;
(b) that the gender of the generic name *Heliothis* Ochsenheimer, 1816, is feminine.

(2) The family-group name HELIOTHINAE (ex Heliothidi) Boisduval, 1828, type genus *Heliothis* Ochsenheimer, 1816, is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 568.

(3) The generic name *Heliothis* Ochsenheimer, 1816 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Samouelle, 1819, *Phalaena dipsacea* Linnaeus, 1767, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2257.

(4) The specific name *dipsacea* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen *Phalaena dipsacea*, (specific name of the type species of *Heliothis* Ochsenheimer, 1816) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2954.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2306

An application for a ruling on the stem and gender of *Heliothis* Ochsenheimer, 1816, was first received from Dr I. W. B. Nye (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) on 15 May 1979. It was sent to the printer on 13 July 1979 and published on 25 September 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 186–189, with an additional comment by the Secretary published on p. 190. The application received support from Dr R. Feige (*Caracas, Venezuela*) and Dr W. Reed (*International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics, Hyderabad, India*). No adverse comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)39 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 189. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss, Heppell

Negative Votes — none (0).
Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No voting papers were returned by Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Willink.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

dipsacea Linnaeus, 1767, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 12, p. 856
HELIOTHINAE (ex Heliothidi) Boisduval, 1828, *Europaeorum Lepidopterorum Index Methodicus*, p. 94
Heliothis Ochsenheimer, 1816, *Schmett. Eur.* vol. 4, p. 91.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)39 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1312.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
29 October 1984

OPINION 1313

TESTUDO SCRIPTA SCHOEPFF, 1792 AND *EMYS CATASPILA* GUNTHER, 1885 (REPTILIA, TESTUDINES): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *ventricosa* Gray, 1855, as published in the binomen *Emys ventricosa*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *scripta* Schoepff, 1792, as published in the binomen *Testudo scripta* (Name Number 2955);
(b) *cataspila* Günther, 1885, as published in the binomen *Emys cataspila* (Name Number 2956).

(3) The specific name *ventricosa* Gray, 1855, as published in the binomen *Emys ventricosa*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1144.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2315

An application for the conservation of *Emys cataspila* Günther, 1885 was first received from Dr J. M. Legler (*University of Utah, Salt Lake City, U.S.A.*), Professor H. M. Smith and Dr R. B. Smith (*University of Colorado, Boulder, U.S.A.*) on 26 June 1979. After some correspondence it was agreed that *Testudo scripta* Schoepff, 1792 should also be included in the application for conservation. A revised manuscript was sent to the printers on 15 April 1980 and published on 4 December 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, pp. 240–246. Public notice of the possible use of plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to six general and four specialist periodicals. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)40 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 244. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — fifteen (15) received in the following order: Melville, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Heppell, Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Votes — one (1): Holthuis.
Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No voting papers were returned by Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Willink.

Holthuis commented: 'It seems best to me, in this case of a subspecies, the nomenclatural status of which is far from settled, to adopt strict priority.'

Hahn commented: 'The authors wish to suppress only the species-group name *ventricosa* Gray, 1855, but not *mobilensis* Holbrook, 1838. Are *ventricosa* and *mobilensis* not synonyms, as indicated in the first paragraph, and does *mobilensis* not compete with *cataspila*?'

Professor Hobart M. Smith replied on behalf of all the authors of the application: 'Through the help of Dr John B. Iverson, I've learned that the latest revisionary work on this group of turtles (Joseph P. Ward, 1984, "Relationships of chrysemyd turtles of North America (Testudines: Emydidae)," *Spec. Publs. Mus. Texas Tech. Univ.*, (21): 1–50) places Holbrook's 1838 *Emys mobilensis* (p. 38) as a junior synonym of *Emys hieroglyphica* Holbrook, 1836, now *Pseudemys (Pseudemys) concinna hieroglyphica*. This same author places *scripta*, to which *ventricosa* and *cataspila* belong, in the genus *Trachemys*.

'Hence there need be no concern that *mobilensis* of Holbrook enters into nomenclatural conflict with either *ventricosa* or *cataspila*. We nevertheless much appreciate the Commission member's concern.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

cataspila Gunther, 1885, *Biologia centrali-americana*, Reptilia and Batrachia, p. 4, pl. 6, fig. B

scripta Schoepff, 1792, *Historia testudinum iconibus illustrata*, p. 16, pl. 3, figs. 4.5

ventricosa, Gray, 1855, *Catalogue of shield reptiles in the collection of British Museum*. Part I. Testudinata (tortoises), p. 28, pl. 14.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)40 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1313.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
30 October 1985

OPINION 1314

HYDROPHORUS NEBULOSUS FALLÉN, 1823, IS THE TYPE SPECIES OF *HYDROPHORUS* FALLÉN, 1823 (INSECTA, DIPTERA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, all designation of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Hydrophorus* Fallén, 1823, are hereby set aside and *Hydrophorus nebulosus* Fallén, 1823 is hereby designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The generic name *Hydrophorus* Fallén, 1823 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Hydrophorus nebulosus* Fallén, 1823, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2258.

(3) The specific name *nebulosus* Fallén, 1823, as published in the binomen *Hydrophorus nebulosus* (specific name of type species of *Hydrophorus* Fallén, 1823) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2957.

(4) The subfamily name HYDROPHORINAE Lioy, 1864 or Schiner, 1864 (type genus *Hydrophorus* Fallén, 1823) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 569.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2036

An application for the use of the plenary powers to fix the type species of *Hydrophorus* Fallén, 1823 was first received from Dr George Steyskal (*Systematic Entomology Laboratory, USDA, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington D.C. 20560*) and others on 1 March 1973. The subsequent history of the case was told in the following report that was sent to the members of the Commission with Voting Paper (84)41:

HYDROPHORUS FALLÉN, 1823: REPORT ON A MAJORITY VOTE LESS THAN A TWO-THIRDS MAJORITY

The main point at issue in this case is the choice of type species for the nominal genus *Hydrophorus* Fallén, 1823. In this genus of aquatic Diptera the arista of the antennae is dorsal, whereas in the related genus *Medetera* Fischer, 1819, it is apical.

2. In *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 30, pp. 118–120, Steyskal and others showed that Macquart, 1827, had designated *H. jaculus* Fallén, 1823, one of the originally included species, as type of *Hydrophorus*. They claimed that there was a misidentification in this designation, because in *H. jaculus* the arista is apical as it is in the type species of *Medetera, M. carnivora* Fischer, 1819, and its two senior synonyms, *Musca rostrata* Fabricius, 1775, and *Musca diadema* Linnaeus, 1787. Reference to the Commission was therefore obligatory under Article 70a of the Code. Macquart had, in effect, synonymised *Hydrophorus* and *Medetera*. In consequence, the genus in

which the arista is dorsal would have to be called *Aphrozeta* Perris, a name used only once (by Coquillett, 1910) since its publication.

3. [This paragraph showed that the date of *Aphrozeta* is to be cited as 1850 and is not relevant in the present context.]

4. To avert the consequences outlined in paragraph 2 of this report, Steyskal and others asked that the plenary powers be used to set aside all designations of type species for *Hydrophorus* and that *H. nebulosus* Fallén, 1823 be designated as type. This is one of the originally included species and its arista is dorsal.

5. In *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 31, pp. 173–177 Hendrickson & Roback commented on the application by Steyskal and others. They agreed that Macquart's designation of *H. jaculus* should be set aside, thus implicitly accepting the need to conserve *Hydrophorus* as the name of the genus in which the arista is dorsal, and they agreed that, if this was not done, *Hydrophorus* would have to be replaced by the practically unused *Aphrozeta*. They opposed the choice of *H. nebulosos* as type species because they thought it was an aberrant species, and proposed *H. binotatus* Fallén, 1823 in its place.

6. In *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, pp. 79–80 Steyskal replied that *H. nebulosus*, apart from its additional wing spots, was in fact entirely compatible with the traditional concept of *Hydrophorus*. He said that *H. binotatus*, on the other hand, not only showed some unusual features but was easily confused with another species.

7. Hendrickson & Roback had claimed that there was no misidentification involved in Macquart's designation of *H. jaculus*. Their request for the use of the plenary powers to designate *H. binotatus* was therefore based solely on the need to conserve *Hydrophorus* in its accepted sense. However, the arguments they adduce on this side of their case are not strong. They merely show that Macquart had accepted an earlier (1824) error of Meigen's in dealing with *Medeterus* (sic) and *Hydrophorus* and do not seriously weaken the argument of Steyskal and others on this point.

8. On 24 February 1977 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on V.P.(77)9 either for the proposals of Steyskal and others (Alternative A) or for those of Hendrickson & Roback (Alternative B). At the close of the voting period on 23 May 1977 there were 13 votes for Alternative A and 9 for Alternative B — a majority less than a two-thirds majority for Alternative A.

9. The matter therefore comes down to a simple choice as to which of two species — *H. nebulosus* Fallén, 1823, or *H. binotatus* Fallén, 1823 — is to be the type species of *Hydrophorus*. This is a taxonomic choice, and I have therefore been seeking independent specialist advice to guide the Commission. Dr C. E. Dyte (*Ministry of Agriculture Slough Laboratory, Slough, U.K.*) had already supported Steyskal and others. Eventually, in August 1983, with the help of Mr R. W. Sims (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) and Dr Kerzhner (*Zoological Institute, Leningrad*), Professor O. P. Negrobov (*Voronezh University, U.S.S.R.*) wrote to say that

he too supported the choice of *H. nebulosus* as type species 'as it does not differ greatly from other species of the genus, including the hypopygium (Negrobov, 1977, in Lindner, *Die Fliegen der palaearktischen Region*, Lief. 316, figs 1127–1130). The external difference in wing spots is not important.'

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

The above report was sent, with Voting Paper (1984)41, on 13 September 1984 to the members of the Commission for a vote under the Three-Month Rule. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984, the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes for *H. nebulosus:* twenty-one (21), received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Willink, Trjapitzin, Halvorsen, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Kraus, Ride, Corliss, Schuster, Bayer, Heppell, Dupuis, Binder

Affirmative Votes for *H. binotatus:* none (0)

Negative Votes, Late Votes, Abstentions: none (0).

No voting papers were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Lehtinen and Savage.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

binotatus, Hydrophorus, Fallén, 1823, *Monographia Dolichopodum Sveciae*, p. 3

HYDROPHORINAE Lioy, 1864, *Atti r. Ist. Veneto Sci., Lett. Arti* (3), vol. 9, p. 762

Hydrophorus Fallén, 1823, *Monographia Dolichopodum Sveciae*, p. 3

nebulosus, Hydrophorus, Fallén, 1823, *Monographia Dolichopodum Sveciae*, p. 3.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)41 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1314.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
17 January 1985

OPINION 1315
EOLIS ALDERI COCKS, 1852 IS THE TYPE SPECIES OF *AEOLIDIELLA* BERGH, 1867 (MOLLUSCA, GASTROPODA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

- (a) all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Aeolidiella* Bergh, 1867 are hereby set aside and *Eolis alderi* Cocks, 1852 is hereby designated as type species of that genus;
- (b) the following specific names are hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy:
  - (i) *soemmerringii* Leuckart, 1828, as published in the binomen *Eolida soemmerringii*;
  - (ii) *soemmeringii* Bergh, 1882, as published in the binomen *Aeolidiella soemmeringii*.

(2) Entry No. 1720 on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology is hereby amended so as to read: *Aeolidiella* Bergh, 1867 (gender: feminine) type species, by designation under the plenary powers, *Eolis alderi* Cocks, 1852.

(3) The specific name *alderi* Cocks, 1852, as published in the binomen *Eolis alderi* (specific name of type species of *Aeolidiella* Bergh, 1867) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2958.

(4) Entry No. 2152 on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology is hereby deleted.

(5) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (i) *soemmerringii* Leuckart, 1828, as published in the binomen *Eolida soemmerringii*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) (i) above (Name Number 1145);
- (ii) *soemmeringii* Bergh, 1882, as published in the binomen *Aeolidiella soemmeringii*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) (ii) above (Name Number 1146).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1986

An application for the clarification of the type species of *Aeolidiella* Bergh, 1867 was first received from the late Dr Henning Lemche on 28 October 1971. This was never published because of difficulties over Dr Lemche's choice of a neotype for *Eolida soemmerringii* Leuckart, 1828. In November 1979 consultations were opened with Dr T. E. Thompson and Dr Gregory H. Brown. On 14 March 1980, revised proposals were received from Dr Brown. After some correspondence this was sent to the printer on 24 February 1981 and published on 30 November 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*

vol. 38, pp. 294–296. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and one specialist serial. Support was received from Dr Jean Tardy (*Institut Universitaire de Technologie, La Rochelle, France*).

Dr Holthuis objected to the proposed changes in the Official Lists and suggested that a neotype for the species that was before Bergh in 1867 could be designated as neotype of *Eolida soemmerringii* Leuckart, 1828. This, however, proved impracticable.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)44 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 295–296. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Willink, Trjapitzin, Halvorsen, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Kraus, Ride, Corliss, Schuster, Bayer, Heppell, Dupuis, Binder

Negative Votes — none (0).

No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Lehtinen and Savage.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

alderi, Eolida, Cocks, 1852, *Naturalist*, vol. 2, p. 1

soemmeringii, Aeolidiella, Bergh, 1882, *Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien* for 1882, p. 8

soemmerringii. Eolida, Leuckart, 1828, *Breves Animalium*, p. 16.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)44 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1315.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
17 January 1985

OPINION 1316
GLOBIGERINA CERROAZULENSIS COLE, 1928 (FORAMINIFERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *applanata* Hantken, 1883, as published in the binomen *Globigerina applanata*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *cerroazulensis* Cole, 1928, as published in the binomen *Globigerina cerroazulensis* (Name Number 2959);
(b) *tropicalis* Blow & Banner, 1962, as published in the binomen *Globigerina tropicalis* (Name Number 2960).

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *applanata* Hantken, 1883, as published in the binomen *Globigerina applanata*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above (Name Number 1147);
(b) *globosa* Hantken, 1883, as published in the binomen *Globigerina globosa* (a junior primary homonym of *Globigerina globosa* von Hagenow, 1842) (Name Number 1148).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2248

An application for the conservation of *Globigerina cerroazulensis* Cole, 1928 was first received on 27 January 1978 from Dr R. M. Jeffords (then of *Exxon Production Research Co., Houston, Texas*) on behalf of himself, Dr R. M. Stainforth (*2910 Cook St, Victoria, B.C., Canada*) and Dr K. Sztrakos (*13 rue Gouveno, 77310 Ponthierry, France*). After some correspondence it was sent to the printer on 24 February 1981 and published on 11 March 1982 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 45–49. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and three specialist serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)45 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 47. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Schuster, Willink, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Ride, Kraus, Corliss, Bayer, Heppell, Binder

Negative Votes — none (0).

No voting papers were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Dupuis, Halvorsen, Lehtinen and Savage.

Hahn commented: 'In the case of *applanata/cerroazulensis* the facts are clear, but not so in the case of *globosa/tropicalis*. The type of *G. globosa* Hantken is "interpreted" as a juvenile specimen of *tropicalis*, but can it also be interpreted as an adult of some other species? Once again this is a situation where I should prefer to use the relative precedence procedure.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

applanata, Globigerina, Hantken, 1883, *Ertek. Termesz. Köreböl Tud. Akad.*, vol. 13, p. 11, pl. 2, fig. 3

cerroazulensis, Globigerina, Cole, 1928, *Bull. amer. Paleontol.*, vol. 14, no. 53, p. 17

globosa, Globigerina, Hantken, 1883, *Ertek. Termesz. Köreböl Tud. Akad.*, vol. 13, p. 11, pl. 2, fig. 7

tropicalis, Globigerina, Blow & Banner, 1962, in Eames, F. E. *et al*, *Fundamentals of mid-Tertiary stratigraphic correlation*, p. 124.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)45 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1316.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
21 January 1985

OPINION 1317
TUPUS SELLARDS, 1906 (INSECTA, PROTODONATA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) The generic name *Tupus* Sellards, 1906 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Tupus permianus* Sellards, 1906, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2259.

(2) The specific name *permianus* Sellards, 1906, as published in the binomen *Tupus permianus* (specific name of type species of *Tupus* Sellards, 1906) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2961.

(3) The generic name *Typus* Sellards, 1909 (an unjustified emendation of *Tupus* Sellards, 1906) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2161.

(4) The family-group name TYPIDAE Handlirsch, 1919 is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 503.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2359

An application for the conservation of the unjustified emendation *Typus* Sellards, 1909 was first received from Professor Frank M. Carpenter (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard, Mass.*) and Dr Paul Whalley (*British Museum (Natural History) London*) on 2 September 1980. It was accompanied by a counter-proposal by Mr D. L. F. Sealy (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) to the effect that the correct original spelling be retained. Both were sent simultaneously to the printer on 24 February 1981 and published side by side on 30 November 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 285–287. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and nine entomological serials. No further comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)46 either A for the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, p. 286, or B for those set out on p. 287. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

For Alternative A — four (4) received in the following order: Trjapitzin, Halvorsen, Alvarado, Binder

For Alternative B — seventeen (17) received in the following order:

Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Willink, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Kraus, Ride, Corliss, Schuster, Bayer, Heppell, Dupuis.

No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Lehtinen and Savage.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Hahn: 'I fully agree with the objection raised by Mr Sealy in his paragraph 2.'

Starobogatov: 'We must avoid using a nomenclatorial term as a generic name.'

Alvarado: 'I do not agree with the spelling TUPIDAE.'

Ride: 'In my opinion no case is made that to revert to the correct original spelling would "disturb stability or universality or cause confusion". In the absence of such a case the Commission is not entitled to use the plenary powers.'

Dupuis: 'L'argumentation du point 2 de M. Sealy est excellente; elle souligne une lacune du Code.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to names placed on Official Lists and Official Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

permianus, Tupus, Sellards, 1906, *Amer. J. Sci.* (4) vol. 22, p. 249
Tupus Sellards, 1906, *Amer. J. Sci.* (4) vol. 22, p. 249
TYPIDAE Handlirsch, 1919, *Denkschr. Akad. Wiss. Wien, math.-nat. Kl.*, vol. 96, p. 62
Typus Sellards, 1909, *Amer. J. Sci.* (4) vol. 27, p. 151.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)46 were cast as set out above, that the proposal in Alternative B of that voting paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1317.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
23 January 1985

OPINION 1318
(OPINION CORRECTING THE RULING GIVEN IN OPINION 92) *LACERTA VELOX* PALLAS, 1771 IS THE TYPE SPECIES OF *EREMIAS* WIEGMANN, 1834 (REPTILIA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Eremias* Wiegmann, 1834 are hereby set aside and the nominal species *Lacerta velox* Pallas, 1771 is hereby designated as the type species of that genus.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Eremias* Wiegmann, 1834 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Lacerta velox* Pallas, 1771 (Name Number 432);
(b) *Ommateremias* Lantz, 1928 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Lacerta arguta* Pallas, 1773 (Name Number 2260).

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *velox* Pallas, 1771, as published in the binomen *Lacerta velox* (specific name of type species of *Eremias* Wiegmann, 1834) (Name Number 2962);
(b) *arguta* Pallas, 1773, as published in the binomen *Lacerta arguta* (specific name of type species of *Ommateremias* Lantz, 1928) (Name Number 2963).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1172

In February 1957 the late Mr Francis Hemming (then Secretary to the Commission) discovered an error in the ruling given in Opinion 92. That ruling gave *Lacerta velox* Pallas, 1771 as type species of *Eremias* Wiegmann, 1834; but Fitzinger, 1843, *Syst. Rept.* p. 21, had validly designated *Lacerta variabilis* Pallas, 1811 as type species. He therefore sought advice from several sources but received no clear indication of a course to follow. Accordingly, when the first instalment of the Official Lists in book form was being compiled in 1958, the case of *Eremias* was deferred.

In December 1980, Mr A. F. Stimson (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) kindly examined an application prepared in the Secretariat. This was sent to the printer on 24 February 1981 and published on 30 November 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 283–284. The possible use of the plenary powers in the case was announced in the same part of the

Bulletin and was sent to the statutory serials as well as to seven general and three herpetological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)47 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 283–284. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Schuster, Willink, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Kraus, Ride, Corliss, Bayer, Heppell, Dupuis, Binder

Negative Votes — none (0).

No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Halvorsen, Lehtinen and Savage.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

arguta, Lacerta, Pallas, 1773, *Reise Russland*, vol. 2, p. 718
Eremias Wiegmann, 1834, *Herpetol. Mexic.* (1), p. 9
Ommateremias Lantz, 1928, *Bull. Mus. Géorgie* (4) p. 2
velox, Lacerta, Pallas, 1771, *Reise Russland*, vol. 1, p. 457.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)47 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1318.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
23 January 1985

OPINION 1319

NOMIOIDES SCHENCK, 1866 (INSECTA, HYMENOPTERA): DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, all designations of type species for the nominal genus *Nomioides* Schenck, 1866 hitherto made are hereby set aside and the nominal species *Apis minutissima* Rossi, 1790, is hereby designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The generic name *Nomioides* Schenck, 1866 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Apis minutissima* Rossi, 1790, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2261.

(3) The specific name *minutissima* Rossi, 1790, as published in the binomen *Apis minutissima* (specific name of the type species of *Nomioides* Schenck, 1866) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2964.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2178

An application for the use of plenary powers to designate a type species for *Nomioides* Schenck, 1866 was first received from Dr Y. A. Pesenko and Dr I. M. Kerzhner (*Zoological Institute, Leningrad*) on 5 May 1976. After much correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 24 February 1981 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 225–227. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and nine entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)48 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, p. 226. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Schuster, Willink, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Kraus, Ride, Corliss, Bayer, Heppell, Dupuis, Binder

Negative Votes — none (0).

No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Halvorsen, Lehtinen and Savage.

Heppell commented: 'I believe that the genus *Nomioides* could be accepted as of feminine gender if that is in accordance with universal usage (as stated by the applicants). There is at least one feminine *-oides* generic name on the Official List (*Cecilioides*), which is universally treated as feminine by malacologists.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:
minutissima, Apis, Rossi, 1790, *Fauna Etrusca*, vol. 2, p. 109. Liburni (Pisis)
Nomioides Schenck, 1866, *Berlin Entomol, Zeitschr.*, vol. 10, p. 333.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)48 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1319.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
23 January 1985

OPINION 1320

HYDRODAMALIS RETZIUS, 1794 AND *MANATUS INUNGUIS* NATTERER IN PELZELN, 1883 (MAMMALIA, SIRENIA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) the generic name *Manati* Steller, 1774 is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

(b) the specific name *exunguis* Natterer in Diesing, 1839, as published in the binomen *Manatus exunguis*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The generic name *Hydrodamalis* Retzius, 1794 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Hydrodamalis stelleri* Retzius, 1794, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2262.

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *gigas* Zimmermann, 1780, as published in the binomen *Manati gigas* (the valid name at the time of this ruling of the type species of *Hydrodamalis* Retzius, 1794) (Name Number 2965);

(b) *inunguis* Natterer in Pelzeln, 1883, as published in the binomen *Manatus inunguis* (rendered nomenclaturally valid under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above) (Name Number 2966).

(4) The generic name *Manati* Steller, 1774, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2162.

(5) The specific name *exunguis* Natterer in Diesing, 1839, as published in the binomen *Manatus exunguis*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1149.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2338

An application for the conservation of *Hydrodamalis* Retzius, 1794 and *Manatus inunguis* Natterer in Pelzeln, 1883 was first received from Dr Daryl P. Domning (*Howard University, Washington D.C.*) on 12 March 1980. It was sent to the printer on 12 August 1980 and published on 30 April 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 130–133. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was published in the same part of the *Bulletin* and sent to the statutory serials as well as to seven general serials and two mammalogical serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)50 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 131–132. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Schuster, Willink, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Kraus, Ride, Corliss, Bayer, Heppell, Dupuis, Binder

Negative Votes — none (0).

No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Halvorsen, Lehtinen and Savage.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and Official Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

exunguis, Manatus, Natterer in Diesing, 1839, *Ann. wiener Mus. Naturges.*, vol. 2(2), p. 230, footnote

gigas, Manati, Zimmermann, 1780, *Geographische Geschichte des Menschen und die vierfüssigen Thiere*, vol. 2, p. 426

Hydrodamalis Retzius, 1794, *K. svensk. Vetenskaps Akad. Handl.* (2) vol. 15, p. 292

inunguis, Manatus, Natterer in Pelzeln, 1883, *Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien*, vol. 33, Beiheft, pp. 89–94

Manati Steller, 1774, *Beschreibung von dem Lande Kamtschatka*, p. 97.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)50 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1320.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
30 January 1985

OPINION 1321

GRANT OF NOMENCLATURAL PRECEDENCE TO EPHYDRIDAE ZETTERSTEDT, 1837 OVER HYDRELLIIDAE ROBINEAU-DESVOIDY, 1830 (INSECTA, DIPTERA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the family-group name EPHYDRIDAE Zetterstedt, 1837 is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the family-group name HYDRELLIIDAE Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, whenever the two are subjectively considered to be synonyms.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Ephydra* Fallén, 1810 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Curtis, 1832, *Ephydra riparia* Fallén, 1813 (Name Number 2263);

(b) *Hydrellia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Coquillett, 1910, *Hydrellia aurifacies* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Name Number 2264).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *riparia* Fallén, 1813, as published in the binomen *Ephydra riparia* (specific name of type species of *Ephydra* Fallén, 1810) (Name Number 2967);

(b) *flaviceps* Meigen, 1830, as published in the binomen *Notiphila flaviceps* (valid name, at the time of this ruling, of the type species of *Hydrellia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830) (Name Number 2968).

(4) The following family-group names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) EPHYDRIDAE Zetterstedt, 1837 (type genus *Ephydra* Fallén, 1810) with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over HYDRELLIIDAE Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (type genus *Hydrellia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830) whenever the two are subjectively considered to be synonymous (Name Number 570);

(b) HYDRELLIIDAE Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (type genus *Hydrellia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830) with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over EPHYDRIDAE Zetterstedt, 1837 whenever the two names are subjectively considered to be synonymous (Name Number 571).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2334

An application for the grant of nomenclatural precedence to EPHYDRIDAE Zetterstedt, 1837 over HYDRELLIIDAE Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 was first received from Dr Wayne N. Mathis (*National Museum of Natural History, Washington D.C.*) on 30 January 1980. After an exchange of correspondence it was sent to the printer on 12 August 1980 and published on 30 July 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 201–204. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and eight entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)49 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 202–203. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — eighteen (18) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Schuster, Willink, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Corliss, Kraus, Bayer, Dupuis, Binder

Negative Vote — one (1): Ride.

Heppell abstained from voting. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Halvorsen, Lehtinen, Savage.

The following comments were sent in by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Ride: 'HYDRELLIIDAE has not so far been used at familial level. Its replacement at that level by EPHYDRIDAE is unambiguous and will cause no confusion. Both names will continue in use at subfamilial and tribal levels. I do not consider that the use of the plenary powers is warranted.'

Heppell: 'I abstain. I should prefer the Commission to reconsider the general problem of priority of family-group names rather than deal with individual cases separately. Many cases of this type are ignored or overlooked, and the date and authorship of family-group names are probably less important than the stability of their taxonomic significance.'

Dupuis: 'Sur le fond, je vote pour les propositions de Mathis: (1) conservation des deux noms; (2) inversion de la priorité de typification des taxa supergénériques. Toutefois, je vote contre la formulation, car deux taxa supergénériques qui n'ont pas le même gênre-type ne sont pas objectivement "synonymes". Je propose de dire, soit (a) "lorsque les deux genres-types sont inclus dans le même taxon", soit (b) "to be subjectively synonyms".' [This has been borne in mind in drafting the present ruling. The use of the word 'considered' had been thought a sufficient indication of a subjective synonymy. R.V.M.]

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Ephydra Fallén, 1810, *Specimen entomologicum novam Diptera disponendi methodum exhibens*, p. 22

EPHYDRIDAE Zetterstedt, 1837, *Isis* (Oken), col. 48

flaviceps, Notiphila, Meigen, 1830, *Syst. Beschr. zweifl. Ins.*, vol. 6, p. 72

Hydrellia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, *Acad. roy. Sci., Mém. prés. divers savans*, vol. 2, p. 790

HYDRELLIDAE Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, *Acad. roy. Sci., Mém. prés. divers savans*, vol. 2, p. 783

riparia, Ephydra, Fallén, 1813, *K. Vetenskaps Akad. Handl.* for 1813, (2), p. 246.

The following are the original references to designations of type species accepted in the present Opinion: of *Ephydra riparia* Fallén, 1813 as type species of *Ephydra* Fallen, 1810 by Curtis, 1832, *British Entomology*, vol. 9, p. 413; of *Hydrellia aurifacies* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, *Acad. roy. Sci., Mém. prés. divers savans*, vol. 2, p. 791; as type species of *Hydrellia* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 by Coquillett, 1910, *Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.*, vol. 37, p. 553.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)49 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1321.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
30 January 1985

OPINION 1322
BUPRESTIS NANA PAYKULL, 1799, NON GMELIN, 1790 (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *nana* Gmelin, 1790, as published in the binomen *Buprestis nana*, and all other uses of that name prior to its use by Paykull, 1799, are hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *nana* Paykull, 1799, as published in the binomen *Buprestis nana*, and as conserved under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2969.

(3) The specific name *nana* Gmelin, 1790, as published in the binomen *Buprestis nana*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1150.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2346

An application for the conservation of *Buprestis nana* Paykull, 1799 was first received from Dr Maciej Mroczkowski (*Instytut Zoologiczny, Warsaw*) on 29 May 1980. After some exchanges of correspondence it was sent to the printer on 24 February 1981 and published on 11 March 1982 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 59–60. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and eight entomological serials. The application was supported by Dr Hans Silfverberg (*Zoological Museum of the University, Helsinki*). No adverse comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)51 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 60. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Schuster, Willink, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Ride, Kraus, Corliss, Bayer, Heppell, Binder

Negative Votes — none (0).

No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Dupuis, Halvorsen, Lehtinen and Savage.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:
nana, Buprestis, Gmelin, 1790, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 13, vol. 1, p. 1940
nana, Buprestis, Paykull, 1799, *Fauna suecica*, vol. 2, p. 233.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)51 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1322.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
30 January 1985

OPINION 1323
BYRRHUS SEMISTRIATUS FABRICIUS, 1794 (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the specific name *semistriatus* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus semistriatus*, is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the specific names *picipes* Olivier, 1790, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus picipes*, and *rufipes* Kugelann, 1792, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus rufipes*, by anyone who considers that these three names, or any two of them, denote the same taxon.

(2) The generic name *Simplocaria* Stephens, 1829 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Jacquelin du Val, 1859, *Byrrhus semistriatus* Fabricius, 1794, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2265.

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *semistriatus* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus semistriatus* (specific name of type species of *Simplocaria* Stephens, 1829) with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over *Byrrhus picipes* Olivier, 1790 and *Byrrhus rufipes* Kugelann, 1792 by anyone who considers that all three names or any two of them denote the same taxon (Name Number 2970);

(b) *picipes* Olivier, 1790, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus picipes*, with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *Byrrhus semistriatus* Fabricius, 1794, by anyone who considers that both names denote the same taxon (Name Number 2971);

(c) *rufipes* Kugelann, 1792, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus rufipes*, with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *Byrrhus semistriatus* Fabricius, 1794, by anyone who considers that both names denote the same taxon (Name Number 2972).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N. (s.)2317

An application for the grant of nomenclatural precedence to *Byrrhus semistriatus* Fabricius, 1794 over *Byrrhus picipes* Olivier, 1790 and *Byrrhus rufipes* Kugelann, 1792 was first received from Dr M. Mroczkowski (*Zoological Institute, Warsaw*) on 31 August 1979. It was sent to the printer on 24 February 1981 and printed on 30 November 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 292–293. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and to eight entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)52 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 18, pp. 292–293. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — eighteen (18) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Schuster, Willink, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Kraus, Corliss, Bayer, Heppell, Binder

Negative Vote — one (1): Ride

Abstention — Uéno.

No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Savage.

Uéno commented: 'I cannot vote on this application at present, though I am inclined to vote against it. Dr Mroczkowski does not clarify whether Olivier's type of *B. picipes* is in existence or not. If it does exist and is in good condition and is identical with that of Fabricius's *B. semistriatus*, I believe the name *picipes* should be revived, even if doing so may cause some confusion among byrrhid taxonomists. Since the beetle seems to have no other importance than in pure taxonomy, I feel it unnecessary to use plenary powers in this case.' This comment was passed on to Dr Mroczkowski who said in reply that, so far as he knew, Olivier's type of *B. picipes* did not exist. He added that Kugelann's collection had been completely destroyed.

Ride commented: 'While it is clearly desirable to conserve *semistriata*, I am not convinced that there is a good reason for preserving *B. picipes* and *B. rufipes*. Neither name has been used in the last 50 years (*picipes* has not been used in systematic works since 1847 and since then has been listed up to 1911, but not as a senior synonym; *rufipes* has not been used since its original description except in listings up to 1911 as a junior synonym). On the other hand, *semistriata* has been in continuous use since 1847. Although no details are presented, it seems that a prima facie case is established that the stability of *semistriata* is threatened (Art. 79b). No case is presented that warrants the preservation of the others. I consider that the Commission should only use the relative precedence procedure when a case is made that justifies the preservation of the names concerned. We should be asked to suppress *picipes* and *rufipes*.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

picipes, Byrrhus, Olivier, 1790, *Entomologie, ou histoire naturelle des Insectes*, no. 13, p. 9.

rufipes, Byrrhus, Kugelann, 1792, *Neuestes Mag. Liebhaber Entomol.*, vol. 1 (2–4), p. 485

semistriata, Byrrhus, Fabricius, 1794, *Entomologia systematica*, vol. 4, p. 437

Simplocaria Stephens, 1829, *Nomenclature of British Insects*, Mandibulata, vol. 3, p. 9.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P. (84)52 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1323.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
4 February 1985

OPINION 1324

DIADEMODON SEELEY, 1894 AND *DIADEMODON TETRAGONUS* SEELEY, 1894 CONSERVED BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *CYNOCHAMPSA* OWEN, 1859 AND *CYNOCHAMPSA LANIARIA* OWEN, 1859 (REPTILIA, THERAPSIDA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, the following names are hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy:

(a) the generic name *Cynochampsa* Owen, 1859;
(b) the specific name *laniaria* Owen, 1859, as published in the binomen *Cynochampsa laniaria*.

(2) The generic name *Diademodon* Seeley, 1894 (gender: masculine), type species, by original designation, *Diademodon tetragonus* Seeley, 1894, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2266.

(3) The specific name *tetragonus* Seeley, 1894, as published in the binomen *Diademodon tetragonus* (specific name of type species of *Diademodon* Seeley, 1984) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2973.

(4) The generic name *Cynochampsa* Owen, 1859, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (a) above is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2163.

(5) The specific name *laniaria* Owen, 1859, as published in the binomen *Cynochampsa laniaria*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1151.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2249

An application for the conservation of the generic name *Diademodon* Seeley, 1894 and the specific name *tetragonus* Seeley, 1894 as published in combination with *Diademodon*, was first received from Dr Fred Grine (*University of Witwatersrand, South Africa*) on 23 June 1980. After some correspondence it was sent to the printer on 24 February 1981 and published on 11 March 1982 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 50–53. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials, three herpetological serials and two palaeontological serials. Support was received from Dr C. E. Gow (*University of the Witwatersrand*) and Dr M. A. Cluver (*South African Museum, Cape Town*). No adverse comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)54 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 52–53. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — fifteen (15) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Willink, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Ride, Kraus, Corliss, Schuster, Bayer, Binder

Negative Votes — five (5) received in the following order: Cocks, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Heppell, Dupuis.

Lehtinen returned a late affirmative vote. No voting papers were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Halvorsen and Savage.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their votes:

Cocks: 'The issues do not seem to me to be sufficiently important to invoke plenary powers and I would sink *Diademodon* in the normal way.'

Hahn: 'The synonymy between *Cynochampsa laniaria* and *Diademodon tetragonus* has not been, and cannot be, proved because *Cynochampsa* is founded on an isolated snout that lacks all important diagnostic features. Thus *Cynochampsa* and *Diademodon* may be synonyms but are not necessarily so. The Commission should therefore not suppress *Cynochampsa laniaria* completely, but only so far as it competes with *Diademodon tetragonus*.'

Mroczkowski: 'I think that the "relative precedence" procedure should have been adopted in this case.'

Ride: Although, strictly speaking, the replacement of *Diademodon* by *Cynochampsa* would not cause any ambiguity (*Cynochampsa* has never been used for anything else), the uncertain stratigraphic position of *C. laniaria* would undoubtedly introduce instability and uncertainty into the application of the names of this important group. I consider that the use of the plenary powers is justified on that ground.'

Heppell: 'This seems too subjective for me to give my vote in favour of the proposal. The author does not establish that the usage of *Diademodon* by the authors cited was notwithstanding their acceptance of *Cynochampsa* as a senior synonym, even at the generic level. From the evidence presented, most, if not all, of these authors could have regarded *C. laniaria* as a Diademodontid incertae sedis. It is also not clear why the author states "Owen's 1859 paper was published unaltered in 1860" yet dates *C. laniaria* from the later paper. Were the names nomina nuda in 1859?'

[On receiving Mr Heppell's comment I made further enquiries into the circumstances surrounding *Cynochampsa laniaria*. The name was published twice by Owen in the publications of the Geological Society of London. The first occasion was in the *Abstracts of Proceedings* no. 31, p.

116. This is part of the proceedings for the Session 1858–59 and deals with the meeting of 20 April 1859. The Librarian of the Society tells me that these Abstracts would certainly have been published in 1859. The binomen is there accompanied by a full description and is available. The second occasion was in the Society's *Quarterly Journal*, vol. 16, pt. 1, Proceedings, p. 61, pl. 3, figs. 1–4, dated 1860. Both components of the binomen therefore date from 1859 and this has been taken as their date in drafting the present Ruling. R.V.M.]

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and Official Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Cynochampsa Owen, 1859, *Q. J. geol. Soc. London* (1) *Proc. geol. Soc. London,* vol. 16, p. 61

Diademodon Seeley, 1894, *Phil. Trans. roy. Soc. London* (B) vol. 185, p. 1030

laniaria, Cynochampsa Owen, 1859, *Q. J. geol. Soc. London* (1) *Proc. geol. Soc.* London, vol. 16, p. 61

tetragonus, Diademodon, Seeley, 1894, *Phil. Trans. roy. Soc. London,* (B) vol. 185, p. 1030.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)54 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1324.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
5 February 1985

OPINION 1325

CAPSUS ATER JAKOVLEV, 1889 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA, HETEROPTERA): NOT REJECTED AS A JUNIOR HOMONYM OF *CIMEX ATER* LINNAEUS, 1758

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, it is hereby ruled that the specific name *ater* Jakovlev, 1889, as published in the binomen *Capsus ater*, is not to be rejected as a junior homonym of the specific name *ater* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Cimex ater*, by any zoologist who places those species in different genera.

(2) The specific name *ater* Jakovlev, 1889, as published in the binomen *Capsus ater*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with an endorsement that it is not to be rejected as a junior secondary homonym of *ater* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Cimex ater* by any zoologist who places those species in different genera (Name Number 2974).

(3) The specific name *ater* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Cimex ater*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with an endorsement that it is not to be interpreted as a senior secondary homonym of *ater* Jakovlev, 1889, as published in the binomen *Capsus ater* by any zoologist who places those species in different genera (Name Number 2975).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2148

An application for the use of plenary powers to make the specific name *ater* Jakovlev, 1889, nomenclaturally valid, was first received from Dr I. M. Kerzhner (*Zoological Institute, Leningrad*) on 18 September 1975. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 24 March 1981 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 34, pp. 288–291. Public notice of the possible use of plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials and nine entomological serials. Comment was received from Professor L. B. Holthuis which was published, together with a reply from Dr Kerzhner containing modified proposals, in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 162–163. No other comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)55 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, p. 163. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — seventeen (17) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Willink, Trjapitzin, Halvorsen, Uéno, Starobogatov, Alvarado, Ride, Corliss, Schuster, Bayer, Heppell, Dupuis, Sabrosky

Negative Votes — four (4) received in the following order: Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Kraus, Binder.

Lehtinen was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger and Savage.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on the Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

ater, Capsus, Jakovlev, 1889, *Horae Soc. entomol. Rossicae*, vol. 24, p. 344
ater, Cimex, Linnaeus, 1758, *Systema Naturae*, ed. 10, p. 447.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (84)55 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1325.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
13 February 1985

OPINION 1326
CIMEX QUADRIPUNCTATUS FABRICIUS, 1794 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA, HETEROPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, the specific name *quadripunctatus* Villers, 1789, as published in the binomen *Cimex quadripunctatus*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *quadripunctatus* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Lygaeus quadripunctatus*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2976.

(3) The specific name *quadripunctatus* Villers, 1789, as published in the binomen *Cimex quadripunctatus*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1152.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2148

An application for the use of plenary powers to make the specific name *quadripunctatus* Villers, 1789, nomenclaturally valid, was first received from Dr I. M. Kerzhner (*Zoological Institute, Leningrad*) on 18 September 1975. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 24 March 1981 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 34, pp. 288–291. Public notice of the possible use of plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials and nine entomological serials. Comment was received from Professor L. B. Holthuis which was published, together with a reply from Dr Kerzhner containing modified proposals for the suppression of *quadripunctatus* Villers, 1789, in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 163–163. No other comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)56 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 163. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — eighteen (18) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Hahn, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Willink, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Starobogatov, Alvarado, Ride, Corliss, Schuster, Bayer, Heppell, Dupuis, Sabrosky

Negative Votes — two (2) received in the following order: Kraus, Binder.

Lehtinen was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Halvorsen and Savage.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:
quadripunctatus, Cimex, Villers, 1789, *Linn. Entomol*, p. 535
quadripunctatus, Lygaeus, Fabricius, 1794, *Entomol. Syst.*, vol. 4, p. 172.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (84)56 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1326.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
13 February 1985

OPINION 1327
HOLOCENTROPUS McLACHLAN, 1878 (INSECTA, TRICHOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the generic name *Holocentropus* McLachlan, 1878 is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the generic name *Phryganeolitha* Germar, 1813 whenever the two names are considered synonyms.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Holocentropus* McLachlan, 1878 (gender: masculine), type species, by original designation, *Philopotamus dubius* Rambur, 1842, with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over *Phryganeolitha* Germar, 1813, whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2267);

(b) *Phryganeolitha* Germar, 1813 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Phryganeolitha vetusta* Germar, 1813, with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *Holocentropus* McLachlan, 1878, whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2268).

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *dubius* Rambur, 1842, as published in the binomen *Philopotamus dubius* (specific name of the type species of *Holocentropus* McLachlan, 1878) (Name Number 2977);

(b) *vetusta* Germar, 1813, as published in the binomen *Phryganeolitha vetusta* (specific name of the type species of *Phryganeolitha* Germar, 1813) (Name Number 2978).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1591

An application for the conservation of *Holocentropus* McLachlan, 1878 was first received from D. E. Kimmins (*Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), London*) on 16 January 1963. The application was rewritten and resubmitted by Dr P. C. Barnard (*Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), London*) on 5 April 1982. After some correspondence it was sent to the printer on 25 August 1982 and published on 7 December 1982 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 293–296. Public notice of the possible use of plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, six general and nine entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)58 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 294–295. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — eighteen (18) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Schuster, Willink, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Ride, Kraus, Corliss, Bayer, Binder

Negative Votes — one (1): Heppell.

Lehtinen was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Dupuis, Halvorsen and Savage.

Heppell commented: 'I sympathize with the intention of the applicant to conserve the name *Holocentropus* but from the evidence presented I can find no justification for the use of the relative precedence procedure in this case. The applicant has presented the strongest possible case for the suppression of the name *Phryganeolitha* (based on a species of uncertain identity, the type material of which is lost, and virtually unused since its original proposal), which he admits was the original purpose of the application. Although it is stated in the introduction that the 'original intentions' of the application have been retained, the Commission has now in fact been offered the option of adding *Phryganeolitha* to the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names.

'I accept that if the Commission were offered the choice of *either* rejection or conditional suppression then the votes might provide no clear majority for either alternative. I believe, however, that the Commission should be asked to lay down clear guidelines to applicants as to when the relative precedence procedure should be requested. This should not be left to the whim of the author or the discretion of the Secretary and, I believe, should be reserved for those few cases where there is a genuine possibility of both names involved being required to denote separate taxa. In the present case I would have readily voted for the rejection of the unused and superfluous name, but in the absence of such a proposal doubt if the conservation of *Holocentropus* is threatened because its synonymy with the senior *Phryganeolitha* is not susceptible to proof.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

dubius, *Philopotamus*, Rambur, 1842, *Histoire naturelle des Insectes. Névroptères*, p. 503

Holocentropus McLachlan, 1878, *A monographic revision and synopsis of the Trichoptera of the European fauna*. Part 7, p. 400

Phryganeolitha Germar, 1813, *Magazin Entomol. (Germar)*, vol. 1, p. 17
vetusta, Phryganeolitha, Germar, 1813, *Magazin Entomol. (Germar)*, vol. 1, p. 17.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (1985)58 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1327.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
18 February 1985

DIRECTION 118

CORRECTIONS TO THREE ENTRIES IN THE OFFICIAL LIST OF FAMILY-GROUP NAMES IN ZOOLOGY: ARGYNNIDAE, APATURIDAE, LIMENITIDINAE (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA)

RULING. — (1) The following corrections are hereby made to the entries in the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology under the Name Numbers stated:

(a) Name Number 228. ARGYNNIDAE. For 'Duponchel, 1844, *Cat. méth. Lépid. Europ.*: 2' read 'Duponchel, [1835] (in Godart, J.B.) *Hist. nat. Lép. pap. France,* Suppl., vol. 1, livr. 23, pp. 394, 395';

(b) Name Number 229. APATURIDAE. For 'Boisduval, 1840, *Gen. Index meth. europ. Lepid.*: 24' read '*Genera et Index methodicus europaeorum Lepidopterorum*, p. 24';

(c) Name Number 231. LIMENITIDINAE. For 'Butler, 1869, *Cat. diurn. Lep. Fabricius*: 57' read 'Butler, [12 February 1870], *Cat. diurn, Lep. Fabricius*, p. 57'.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2187

A request for the correction of a number of entries in the official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology was first received from Lt-Col. C. F. Cowan (*Grange–over–Sands, England*) on 24 June 1976. His request was divided into a number of instalments; that containing the three names here dealt with was sent to the printer on 24 February 1981 and published on 30 July 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, p. 228. No use of the plenary powers was involved.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)53 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* Vol. 38, p. 228. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Schuster, Willink, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Ride, Kraus, Corliss, Bayer, Heppell, Dupuis, Binder

Negative Votes — none (0).

Lehtinen returned a late affirmative vote. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Halvorsen and Savage.

Heppell commented: 'The proposed corrections are matters of fact, not opinion. Why would the Commission wish to perpetuate inadvertent errors? I suggest that the Secretary seek permission to publish such corrections without requiring a Commission vote, subject only to a prior check on the accuracy of the information. Or perhaps a notification of a proposed change could be published, if there is any uncertainty about the information supplied, and the correction made, if no contrary evidence is received before an agreed time has elapsed. Such an arrangement could prove particularly useful for correcting date and authorship of family-group names, which are often incorrectly cited in the zoological literature.'

REPLY TO MR HEPPELL

Mr Heppell's concern for the swift and smooth dispatch of business is appreciated. However, the Official Lists and Indexes are the property and responsibility of the Commission. No name should be added or removed, or any entry altered, without the Commission's consent; and that consent should be seen to have been attained openly after the proposed alteration has been published.

To seek permission from the Commission to make an alteration is surely equivalent to calling for a vote.

The idea of a "notification-and-challenge" procedure was introduced at the Copenhagen (1953) Congress in relation to a number of points in the old Rules. It is in fact of little practical use due to the lack of challengers and was not retained in the 1961 Code. It would provide an uncertain way to accuracy and completeness of List and Index entries.

The present procedure is indeed cumbersome and uses resources of time, effort and *Bulletin* space that might be put to better use. The Commission might like to consider delegating authority to make alterations of fact to the Lists and Indexes to a standing committee or to the Council; such changes to be simply announced in the *Bulletin*. The introduction of such a policy would, I believe, require no more than a change in the By–Laws. [R.V.M.]

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)53 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Direction No. 118.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
5 February 1985

RHABDITIS DUJARDIN, [NOV. 1844] (NEMATODA): PROPOSED COMPLETION OF OFFICIAL LIST ENTRY. Z.N.(S.)937

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
(CIOMS Case no. 4)

Opinion 104 (*Smiths. misc. Colls*, vol. 73 (5), pp. 25–28, 1928) purported to place the generic name *Rhabditis* Dujardin, 1845a (sic) on the Official List. When the first instalments of the Lists were prepared for publication in book form in 1958, entry no. 483 for *Rhabditis* was not completed because of doubts about the identity of the nominal type species of *Rhabditis, R. terricola* Dujardin. However, since Dougherty's action in 1953 (*Thapar commemorative volume*, pp. 69–76) and its general acceptance, the taxonomic situation has stabilised. As the nomenclatural facts are clear and call for no intervention by the Commission, the way is clear for completion of the entry in the Official List.

2. The date of publication of *Rhabditis* Dujardin, *Hist. nat. Helminth.*, pp. 239–243 is [Nov. 1844], as stated by Sherborn, *Index Animalium*, p. 5492. The evidence for this is in *Bibliographie de la France*, 33e année (47e de la collection), No. 44, samedi 2 nov. 1844, p. 574, entry no. 5460.

3. *Rhabditis* was established with four included nominal species: *R. terricola* Dujardin [Nov. 1844], *Vibrio acetis* O. F. Müller, 1783, *V. triticis* Steinbuch, 1799 and *V. glutinis* O. F. Müller, 1783.

4. Stiles & Hassall, 1905, *Bull. Bur. anim. Ind.*, no. 79, pp. 45–46, 134, thought that Bastian, 1865, *Trans. linn. Soc. London*, vol. 25 (2), p. 129, had designated *R. terricola* as type species. In fact, Bastian merely referred to 'the typical *R. terricola*', and from the context, he may have meant 'typical specimens of the species' rather than 'the typical species of the genus'. Even the latter would still not have constituted a designation of a type species. However, the fact that Stiles & Hassall clearly stated their belief and clearly accepted that *R. terricola* was the type species means that they themselves made the designation under Article 69a(iv).

5. At that time the identity of *R. terricola* was in doubt. It remained so until Dougherty, 1953, *Thapar commem. vol.*, pp. 69–76, synonymised the clearly identifiable *R. aspera* Bütschli, 1873 with it. Bütschli described his species in *N. Acta (Verh.) k. leop.-carolin. deutsch. Akad. Naturf.*, vol. 36 (5), pp. 100, 113. This has been accepted by Goodey, T., 1963, *Soil freshw. Nematodes* (London, Methuen), p. 208; by Tarjan, A. C., 1960, *Checklist plant soil nematodes* (Univ. Florida Press, Gainesville), p. 140; and by Tarjan & Hopper, B. E., 1974, *Nomenclatorial compilation plant and soil Nematodes* (Soc. Nematol.), p. 293. In this little-studied group, usage is thus constituted.

6. Various species of *Rhabditis* have been found in human faeces and the female genital tract and in cutaneous lesions. Their pathogenic role is uncertain.

7. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:

(1) to complete entry no. 483 in the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology as follows: *Rhabditis* Dujardin, [Nov. 1844] (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Stiles & Hassall, 1905, *Rhabditis terricola* Dujardin, [Nov. 1844];

(2) to place the specific name *terricola* Dujardin, [Nov. 1844], as published in the binomen *Rhabditis terricola* (specific name of type species of *Rhabditis* Dujardin, [Nov. 1844] on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

TORNATELLINA PFEIFFER, 1842 (MOLLUSCA, GASTROPODA): PROPOSED DIRECTION TO COMPLETE A RULING IN OPINION 119. Z.N.(S.)1147

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

In Opinion 119 (*Smiths. misc. Colls,* vol. 73, no. 7, pp. 23–28, 1931), six generic names of gastropods were placed on the Official List. Among these was *Tornatellina* Pfeiffer, 1842, with the type species stated as '*clausa* Pfeiffer'. When, in 1958, the first instalment of the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology in book form was being prepared, *Tornatellina* was given the Name Number 550; but the entry on the Official List was not completed because of doubts as to the correctness of the ruling in Opinion 119. The facts are simple and allow a ruling to be reached without the use of the plenary powers.

2. The name *Tornatellina* was first proposed by H. H. Beck, 1838 [see Kadolsky, 1971, *Arch. Molluskenk.*, vol. 101, p. 193 for this date], *Index Moll. Mus. Chris. Fred.*, p. 80 and four specific names were cited with it — *clausa, trochiformis, trochlearis* and *archimedes,* all new. All the names are nomina nuda.

3. *Tornatellina* was made available by L. Pfeiffer, 1842, *Symb. hist. helic.* (2). The genus is described on p. 5 and four species on p. 55. Three of these—*clausa, trochiformis* and *trochlearis* — were attributed to Beck. No type species was designated. J. E. Gray, 1847, *Proc. zool. Soc. London,* p. 125 first validly designated *Tornatellina clausa* Pfeiffer, 1842 as type species of *Tornatellina*. This name has for long been regarded as a junior synonym of *Strobilus bilamellatus* Anton, 1839. *Verzeichniss Conch. Samml. Anton,* p. 46. This is still accepted as the valid name for the species. *Tornatellina* (ACHATINIDAE, TORNATELLININAE) and *Strobilus* (ACHATINELLIDAE, PITYSINAE) are now both recognised as valid genera (see Pilsbry & Cooke, 1933, *Nautilus,* vol. 47, pp. 59–62). The type species of *Strobilus* is *S. turritus* Anton, 1839, p. 46, by subsequent designation by Gray, 1847, p. 175 (misspelled as '*Strombilus* Alton'). Opinion 119 purported to reject *Strobilus* Anton because of homonymy with *Strobila* Sars, 1829, a coelenterate, but the names are not homonyms under the present Code.

5. The Commission is accordingly requested:

(1) to place the generic name *Tornatellina* Pfeiffer, 1842 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Gray, 1847, *Tornatellina clausa* Pfeiffer, 1842, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology (Name Number 550);

(2) to place the specific name *bilamellatus* Anton, as published in the binomen *Clausilia (Strobilus) bilamellatus*) (the valid name at the time of this request for the type species of *Tornatellina* Pfeiffer, 1842) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

SOUTHERNIA ALLGEN, 1929: PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *SOUTHERNIA* FILIPJEV, 1927 (NEMATODA). Z.N.(S.)940

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

In 1959 the late Dr Carl Allgén presented a number of problems of nematode nomenclature for resolution by the Commission (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 17, pp. 86–88). The discovery of a mistake in the presentation of one of these problems led to the voting paper eventually issued on the case being cancelled. Among those problems, the one here presented afresh is the only one now calling for the attention of the Commission.

2. *Demania* Southern, 1914 (Nematoda) was found to be a junior homonym of *Demania* Laurie, 1906 (Crustacea) and was replaced by *Rhabdodemania* Baylis & Daubney, 1926. Filipjev, 1927, *Arch. Naturges.*, vol. 91, p. 14, proposed *Southernia* also as a new replacement name for *Demania* Southern *non* Laurie. *Southernia* Filipjev, 1927 is thus a junior objective synonym of *Rhabdodemania* Baylis & Daubney and has not been used.

3. Allgén, 1929, *Zool. Jb.* (Syst.) vol. 57, p. 436, proposed *Southernia* for the single new species *S. zosterae* (pp. 437–438), a free-living marine nematode from off the west coast of Sweden. In spite of the fact that *Southernia* Allgén is a junior homonym of *Southernia* Filipjev, it has been regularly used and no new replacement name has been proposed for it. Gerlach, S. A. & Riemann, F., 1973, The Bremerhaven Checklist of Marine Nematodes, *Veröff. Inst. Meeresforsch. in Bremerhaven,* Suppl. 4, pts 1 and 2, lists nine uses of the name as a valid name between 1929 and 1973; later references can readily be supplied.

4. In the light of this evidence, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Southernia* Filipjev, 1927 and all uses of that name prior to the publication of *Southernia* Allgén, 1929, for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the generic name *Southernia* Allgén, 1929 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Southernia zosterae* Allgén, 1929, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *zosterae* Allgén, 1929, as published in the binomen *Southernia zosterae* (specific name of type species of *Southernia* Allgén, 1929) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the generic name *Southernia* Filipjev, 1927, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

FOLSOMIA CANDIDA WILLEM, 1902 (INSECTA, COLLEMBOLA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *ENTOMOBRYA CAVICOLA* BANKS, 1897. Z.N.(S.)2210

By Peter F. Bellinger (*Department of Biology, California State University, Northridge, California 91330, U.S.A.*)

Banks, 1897, p. 380, described the new species *Entomobrya cavicola* from Mammoth Cave, Kentucky. The figure accompanying his description makes it clear that the species is not an *Entomobrya* but a *Folsomia* (ISOTOMIDAE). This was first recognised in print by Christiansen, 1960, p. 42, where *cavicola* Banks is transferred to *Folsomia* on the basis of this figure. Salmon, 1964, p. 334, placed *cavicola* as a synonym of *Folsomia fimetaria* (Linnaeus, 1758). There are ten other references to the name *cavicola* Banks in the literature; nine of these are merely references to the original description or type locality (e.g. Wolf, 1934–1938, vol. 3, p. 123; Barr, 1968, pp. 166–167).

2. Type specimens of *E. cavicola* Banks are in the United States National Museum. The label on one slide reads '*Entomobrya cavicola* Banks = *Folsomia fimetaria* (L.), det. J. T. Salmon, 1958' and 'Mammoth Cave, Ky. Coll. R. E. Call. Cotype no. 4321'; the label bears a red stripe, presumably applied by Salmon. The specimen is in fair condition and obviously belongs to *Folsomia*. Unfortunately, it is not *F. fimetaria* (L.) as currently recognised, but *F. candida* Willem, 1902. Two other slides marked 'cotype' carry specimens that are also identifiable as *F. candida*. According to the Law of Priority, the name *candida* should now be replaced by the senior name *cavicola* Banks.

3. The various white, blind species of *Folsomia* (including *fimetaria* and *candida*) were not distinguished clearly until recent years. The description of *Podura fimetaria* by Linnaeus, 1758, p. 609, could apply to any of these (or, in fact, to members of several other genera of ISOTOMIDAE or ENTOMOBRYIDAE). In 1767, Linnaeus changed the description of the species; *Podura fimetaria* of the 12th edition of the *Systema Naturae* (p. 1014), and of later authors for more than a century, is a species that does not jump, generally considered to be an *Onychiurus* (the name *Onychiurus fimetarius* is still in use, though illegally, for a widespread European species). Modern interpretations of *P. fimetaria* Linnaeus, 1758, are based on its assignment by Tullberg, 1872, p. 78, to *Isotoma*, and by Börner, 1903, p. 142, to *Folsomia*; and on the interpretation of the name by Stach, 1947, p. 154.

4. Willem, 1902, p. 280, described '*Folsomia candida* nov. gen., nov. sp.' from the Rochefort cave, Belgium. The genus is monotypic. In the years following, *Folsomia* was generally accepted as the valid generic name for species formerly placed in *Isotoma* that have the last three abdominal segments fused; but *candida* was regarded, following Börner, 1903, p. 142, as a

synonym of *fimetaria*. The two species were first distinguished by Stach, 1947, p. 178, who applied the name *candida* to a common European cave species (though without examining material from the type locality of *candida*), and the name *fimetaria*, as noted above, to a different species that is also widespread. Following Stach's redescriptions, *F. candida* was generally recognised by other authors as a very common species that appears to be more generally distributed than *fimetaria* sensu Stach; the latter, for example, is rare in the Nearctic region, where *F. candida* is widespread and abundant in many localities.

5. *F. candida* is facultatively parthenogenetic, and quite variable; in North America there are two distinct phenotype clusters, A and B, which are usually distinguishable, but extensive intergradation between them makes their taxonomic separation impractical. Stach's description applies to form B, and this is apparently the only form found in Europe generally (according to Gisin in a letter to Christiansen); the type specimens of *cavicola* Banks clearly belong to form A.

6. Nomenclature in this group is further complicated by the name *Folsomia cavicola* Cassagnau & Delamare, 1955, p. 381, proposed for a species from a cave in Lebanon, which has also been applied to some British material (Goto, 1956, p. 12). The original description is generally similar to that by Stach of *F. candida,* with some characters like those of form A and some like those of form B; the name is placed as a synonym of *candida* by Gisin, 1960, p. 184 and Palissa, 1964, p. 156. On the other hand, Salmon, 1964, pp. 332–333, lists it as a separate species; this is the only entry for *F. cavicola* to be found in this fundamental reference.

7. Since its recognition following Stach's redescription, *F. candida* has become a favourite experimental animal. More than twenty authors have published papers dealing with this species as a test animal in experiments on litter breakdown, population growth, competition, and insecticide and herbicide assays. In addition, there are many references in the literature to its systematic position, morphology, distribution, habitats and biology; in all, *F. candida* is mentioned in over 400 papers published since 1947 (a list has been deposited with the Commission's Secretariat).

8. The substitution of *cavicola* Banks for *candida* Willem as required by strict application of the Law of Priority would result in the disappearance of a well-known name, that of the nominal type species of *Folsomia*; would cause confusion because of the homonymous, and possibly synonymous, *cavicola* Cassagnau & Delamare; and would lead to permanent uncertainty because of the possible restriction of the name *candida* to form B, if that is regarded as specifically distinct. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *cavicola* Banks, 1897, as published in the binomen *Entomobrya cavicola,* for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

(2) to place the generic name *Folsomia* Willem, 1902 (gender:

feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Folsomia candida* Willem, 1902, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *candida* Willem, 1902, as published in the binomen *Folsomia candida* (specific name of type species of *Folsomia* Willem, 1902) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BANKS, N. 1897. Thysanura. In CALL, R. E., Some notes on the flora and fauna of Mammoth Cave, Ky. *Am. Nat.*, vol. 31, pp. 380–382.

BARR, T. C., Jr. 1968. Ecological studies on the Mammoth Cave system of Kentucky. I. The biota. *Int. J. Speleol.*, vol. 3, pp. 147–204.

BÖRNER, C. 1903. Neue altweltliche Collembolen, nebst Bemerkungen zur Systematik der Isotominen und Entomobryinen. *Sitzungsber. Ges. naturf. Freunde Berlin* for 1903, pp. 129–182.

CASSAGNAU, P. & DELAMARE, C. 1955. Biospeleologica XXV. Mission Henri Coiffait au Liban (1951). 3. Collemboles. *Archs. Zool. exp. gén.*, vol. 91, pp. 365–395.

CHRISTIANSEN, K. 1960. A preliminary survey of the knowledge of North American cave Collembola. *Am. midl. Nat.*, vol. 64, pp. 39–44.

——— & BELLINGER, P. 1980–81. *The Collembola of North America north of the Rio Grande*. iii + 1322 pp. Grinnell College.

GISIN, H. 1960. Collembolenfauna Europas. 312 pp. Geneva, Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle.

GOTO, H. E. 1956. *Folsomia cavicola* Delamare Deboutteville, 1954 (Collembola, Isotomidae, new to Britain. *Entomol. mon. Mag.*, vol. 92, pp. 12–13.

LINNAEUS, C. *Systema Naturae* ed. 10, vol. 1, 824 pp. Holmiae, Laur. Salvii.

———1767. *Systema Naturae* ed. 12, vol. 1, 1327 pp. Stockholm, L. Salvii.

PALISSA, A. 1964. Insekten 1 Teil. Apterygota. *Tierwelt Mitteleuropas*, vol. IV (1a), 407 pp. Leipzig, Quelle & Meyer.

SALMON, J. T. 1964–65. An index to the Collembola. *Bull. Roy. Soc. New Zealand*, vol. 7, pp. 1–651.

STACH, J. 1947. *The apterygotan fauna of Poland in relation to the world fauna of this group of insects.* Family Isotomidae. 488 pp. Acta monogr. Mus. hist. nat. polon.

TULLBERG, T. 1872. Sveriges podurider. *K. svenska Vetensk. Akad. Handl.*, vol. 10 (10), pp. 1–70.

WILLEM, V. 1902. Note préliminaire sur les collemboles des grottes de Han et de Rochefort. *Ann. Soc. entomol. Belgique*, vol. 46, pp. 275–283.

WOLF, B. 1934–38. *Animalium cavernorum catalogus*, vol. III. 918 pp. 's Gravenhage, Junk.

APPENDIX

Characteristics of forms A and B of *F. candida* (Christiansen & Bellinger, 1980, p. 633)

Characteristic		*Form A*	*Form B*
Ventral manubrial setae		23–30	16–22
Third abdominal segment:	$\frac{\text{longest seta}}{\text{segment length}}$	·64–·80	·50–·63
Two basal manubrial setae		1st > 2nd	1st ≃ 2nd
Manubrium/dens		·60–·66	·66–·75

Of 75 populations from various parts of the United States, 31 belonged to form A, 29 to form B and 14 were intermediate in character. Neither form was geographically localised.

Opinion 1316. *Globigerina cerroazulensis* Cole, 1928 (Foraminifera) . . 167
Opinion 1317. *Tupus* Sellards, 1906 (Insecta, Protodonata) 169
Opinion 1318. *Lacerta velox* Pallas, 1771 and *Eremias* Wiegmann, 1834 (Reptilia) (correction of ruling given in Opinion 92) 171
Opinion 1319. *Nomioides* Schenck, 1866 (Insecta, Hymenoptera) . . . 173
Opinion 1320. *Hydrodamalis* Retzius, 1794 and *Manatus inunguis* Natterer in Pelzeln, 1883 (Mammalia, Sirenia) 175
Opinion 1321. EPHYDRIDAE Zetterstedt, 1837 and HYDRELLIIDAE Robineau–Desvoidy, 1830 (Insecta, Diptera) 177
Opinion 1322. *Buprestis nana* Paykull, 1799, non Gmelin, 1790 (Insecta, Coleoptera) 180
Opinion 1323. *Byrrhus semistriatus* Fabricius, 1794 (Insecta, Coleoptera) 182
Opinion 1324. *Diademodon* Seeley, 1894 and *Cynochampsa* Owen, 1859 (Reptilia, Therapsida) 185
Opinion 1325. *Capsus ater* Jakovlev, 1889 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Heteroptera) 188
Opinion 1326. *Cimex quadripunctatus* Fabricius, 1794 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Heteroptera) 190
Opinion 1327. *Holocentropus* McLachlan, 1878 (Insecta, Trichoptera) . 192
Direction 118. ARGYNNIDAE, APATURIDAE and LIMENITIDINAE (Insecta, Lepidoptera) (corrections to entries in Official List) 195

New and revived cases

Rhabditis Dujardin, [Nov. 1844] (Nematoda). The Secretary 197
Tornatellina Pfeiffer, 1842 (Mollusca, Gastropoda). The Secretary . . 199
Southernia Allgen, 1929 and *Southernia* Filipjev, 1927. The Secretary . 200
Folsomia candida Willem, 1902 (Insecta, Collembola): proposed conservation by suppression of *Entomobrya cavicola* Banks, 1897. P. F. Bellinger 201

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature wishes to express its appreciation of the facilities provided by the Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History) for the Secretariat of the Commission.

CONTENTS

Page
Officers and Members of the Commission iii
Members of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature . . iv
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology 99
Special Announcements 100

Comments

Dapsilarthra Foerster, 1862 (Insecta, Hymenoptera). G.C.D. Griffiths; R. Wharton; C. van Achterberg 101
Adianthus bucatus Ameghino, 1891 (Mammalia). R. L. Cifelli; M. F. Soria 103
Atractocera latipes Meigen, 1804 (Insecta, Diptera, Simuliidae). I. M. Kerzhner; H. Zwick; J. E. Raastad; R. W. Crosskey 109
Proposal to amend Article 70 of the Code. J. R. Vockeroth; K. G. A. Hamilton 123

Opinions

Opinion 1298. *Tyrophagus* Oudemans, 1924 (Acarina) 124
Opinion 1299. *Athyreus* Macleay, 1819 and *Glyptus* Brullé, 1835 (Insecta, Coleoptera) 128
Opinion 1300. TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 (Reptilia, Sauria) 130
Opinion 1301. *Artemia* Leach, 1819 (Crustacea, Branchiopoda) . . . 134
Opinion 1302. *Nabis capsiformis* Germar, [1838] (Insecta, Heteroptera, Nabidae) 137
Opinion 1303. *Coccus* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Parthenolecanium* Šulc, 1908 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Homoptera) 139
Opinion 1304. *Melithaea* Milne Edwards & Haime, 1857 and *Isis ochracea* Linnaeus, 1758 (Coelenterata, Anthozoa) 142
Opinion 1305. *Bapta candidaria* Leech, 1897 and *Lamprocabera* Inoue, 1958 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) 144
Opinion 1306. *Ledella bushae* Warén, 1978 and *Ledella* Verrill & Bush, 1897 (Mollusca, Bivalvia) 146
Opinion 1307. *Ptinella* Motschulsky, 1844 and *Nephanes* Thomson, 1859 (Insecta, Coleoptera) 148
Opinion 1308. *Aphis callunae* Theobald, 1915 (Insecta, Hemiptera) . . 150
Opinion 1309. *Geoemyda* Gray, 1834 and *Rhinoclemmys* Fitzinger, 1835 (Reptilia, Testudines) 152
Opinion 1310. *Eutermes exitiosus* Hill, 1925 (Insecta, Isoptera) 154
Opinion 1311. *Corisella* Lundblad, 1928 and *Krizousacorixa* Hungerford, 1930 (Insecta, Heteroptera) 156
Opinion 1312. *Heliothis* Ochsenheimer, 1816 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) . . 158
Opinion 1313. *Testudo scripta* Schoepff, 1792 and *Emys cataspila,* Gunther, 1885 (Reptilia, Testudines) 160
Opinion 1314. *Hydrophorus nebulosus* Fallén, 1823 (Insecta, Diptera) . 162
Opinion 1315. *Eolis alderi* Cocks, 1852 and *Aeolidiella* Bergh, 1867 (Mollusca, Gastropoda) 165

Continued on Inside Back Cover

Printed in Great Britain by Henry Ling Ltd., at the Dorset Press, Dorchester, Dorset

2702

30 September, 1985 Volume 42 Part 3
pp. v–vi, 205–310
ISSN 0007-5167

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

The Official Organ of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

BRITISH MUSEUM
(NATURAL HISTORY)
[illegible] OCT 1985
PURCHASED
ZOOLOGY LIBRARY

COMMONWEALTH AGRICULTURAL BUREAUX

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

Published by: **Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux**

On behalf of: **International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature**
c/o British Museum (Natural History)
Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

Orders and enquiries concerning subscriptions and back numbers should be sent to:

CENTRAL SALES
COMMONWEALTH AGRICULTURAL BUREAUX
FARNHAM ROYAL
SLOUGH SL2 3BN, U.K.

© *International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature 1985.* All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronically, mechanically, by photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia).*

Vice-President: Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden).*

Executive Secretary: Dr. P.K. TUBBS *(British Museum (Natural History). Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD).*

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of election or of most recent re-election)

Prof. Per BRINCK *(Ecology Building, University of Lund, S-223 62, Lund, Sweden)* (30 September 1972) *(Vice-President)* **Arthropoda; Ecology**

Prof. Dr. Raphael ALVARADO *(Departamento de Zoologia, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Madrid, Madrid 28040, Spain)* (30 September 1972) **Echinoidea; Asteroidea**

Dr. L.B. HOLTHUIS *(Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Crustacea**

Dr. G. BERNARDI *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Lepidoptera**

Prof. C. DUPUIS *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) **Heteroptera**

Dr. M. MROCZKOWSKI *(Instytut Zoologiczny, Polska Akademia Nauk. ul. Wilcza 64, Warsaw, Poland)* (14 March 1975) **Coleoptera**

Prof. Dr. Otto KRAUS *(Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum, 2000 Hamburg 13, Germany)* (29 September 1976) **Arachnida, Myriapoda**

Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia)* (29 September 1976) *(President):* **Mammalia: Recent and Fossil**

Dr. H.G. COGGER *(Australian Museum, Sydney 2000, N.S.W. Australia)* (29 September 1976) **Reptilia: E D P Methods**

Prof. Dr. Gerhard HAHN *(Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universitätsgebiet Lahnberge, 3550 Marburg, BRD)* (27 December 1978) **Palaeontology**

Prof. Dr. O. HALVORSEN *(Institute of Biology and Geology, University of Tromsö, P.O. Box 790, N-9001 Tromsö, Norway)* (27 December 1978) **Parasitology**

Dr. V.A. TRJAPITZIN *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad B-164, USSR)* (27 December 1978) **Entomology**

Dr. F.M. BAYER *(U.S. National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) *(Councillor)* **Octocorallia; Systematics**

Prof. John O. CORLISS *(University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Protozoa; Systematics**

Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(93 Lock Road, Ham, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 7LL, U.K.)* (23 August 1979) **Palaeontology**

Dr. Y.I. STAROBOGATOV *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad 199164, U.S.S.R.)* (23 August 1979) **Mollusca, Crustacea**

Dr. P.T. LEHTINEN *(Zoological Museum, Department of Biology, University of Turku. SF-20500 Turku 50, Finland)* (8 August 1980) **Arachnida**

Dr. L.R.M. COCKS *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD)* (26 August 1982) **Brachiopoda**
Mr. David HEPPELL, *(Department of Natural History, Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh EH1 1JF, Scotland)* (26 August 1982) *(Councillor)* **Mollusca**
Prof. Jay M. SAVAGE *(Department of Biology, University of Miami, P.O. Box 249118, Coral Gables, Florida 33124, U.S.A.)* (26 August 1982) **Herpetology**
Prof. R. SCHUSTER *(Institut für Zoologie, Universität Graz, Universitätsplatz 2, A–8010 Graz, Austria)* (26 August 1982) **Acari**
Dr. SHUN-ICHI UENO *(Department of Zoology, National Science Museum, Hyakunincho 3-23-1, Shinjukuku, Tokyo 160, Japan)* (26 August 1982) **Entomology**
Prof. A. WILLINK *(Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, Instituto Miguel Lillo, Miguel Lillo 205, 4000 Tucumán, Argentina)* (26 August 1982) **Neotropical Hymenoptera**
Dr. G. C. GRUCHY *(National Museum of Natural Sciences, Ottawa, Canada, K1A 0M8)* (15 April 1985) **Icthyology**

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Members of the Trust

Professor H.B. Whittington, F.R.S. *(Chairman)*
Dr. F.G.W. Jones *(Secretary and Managing Director)*
Prof. Per Brinck
Prof. J.H. Callomon
Dr. P.F.S. Cornelius
Prof. C.B. Cox
The Rt. Hon. the Earl of Cranbrook, F.L.S., F.Z.S.
Mr. D. Curry
Sir Arthur Drew, K.C.B.
Sir Charles Fleming, K.B.E., F.R.S.
Prof. J. Forest
Col. Francis J. Griffin, O.B.E.
Dr. G.C. Gruchy
Dr. R.H. Hedley, F.I.Biol.
Dr. L.B. Holthuis
Dr. M.K. Howarth
Sir Peter Kent, F.R.S.
Prof. Dr. O. Kraus
Dr. M. Luc
Dr. R.B. Manning
Mr. R.V. Melville
Dr. I.W.B. Nye
Dr. E.P.F. Rose, T.D.
Dr. W.D.L. Ride *(ex officio)*
Dr. G.B. White
Prof. J.M. Dodd, F.R.S. *(Observer for the Royal Society)*

B. The Officers of the Trust

Dr. P.K. Tubbs, M.A., Ph.D. *(Scientific Controller)*
Mr. M.E. Tollitt, M.Sc., F.L.S., F.R.E.S. *(Assistant Zoologist)*
Mr. J.D.D. Smith *(Administrator)*

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 42, part 3 (pp. v–vi, 205–310 30 September 1985

NOTICES

(a) *Invitation to comment.* The Commission is entitled to start to vote on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* six months after the publication of each application. This period is normally extended to enable comments to be submitted. Any zoologist who wishes to comment on any of the applications is invited to send his contribution, in duplicate, to the Secretary of the Commission as quickly as possible, and in any case in time to reach the Secretary within twelve months of the date of publication of the application.

(b) *Possible use of the plenary powers.* The possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers is involved in the following applications published in the present part of the *Bulletin* (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23b and 79b):

(1) *Berytus* Fabricius, 1803 (Insecta, Heteroptera, Berytidae): proposed designation of a type species under the plenary powers. Z.N.(S.) 2464. W.R. Dolling.

(2) *Thylacites* Germar, 1817; *Brachyderes* Schönherr, 1823; *Cycloderes* Sahlberg, 1823; and *Cycloderes* Schönherr, 1823 (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposal to maintain current usage. Z.N.(S.) 2490. A.T. Howden.

(3) *Neodorippe* Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969 (Crustacea, Decapoda): proposed designation of type species. Z.N.(S.) 2467. L.B. Holthuis & R.B. Manning.

*(4) *Sagartia luciae* Verrill, 1898 (Coelenterata, Actiniaria): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2363. R.W. Seaton.

(c) *Receipt of new applications.* The following new applications have been received since going to press for vol. 42 (2) (published on 27 June 1985) (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23b and 79c):

(1) Dates and authorship of the text volumes of the Histoire Naturelle section of Savigny's 'Description de l'Egypte.' Z.N.(S.) 2515. M.E. Tollitt.

(2) *Chromis ternatensis* (Bleeker, 1856) (Pisces, Pomacentridae): proposed conservation by suppression of *Chromis caerulea* (Cuvier, 1830). Z.N.(S.) 2516. J.E. Randall, M.L. Bauchot & M. Desoutter.

*(3) *Siphamia* Weber, 1909 (Pisces, Apogonidae): proposed conservation by suppression of *Beanea* Steindachner, 1902. Z.N.(S.) 2517. J.E. Randall, E.A. Lachner & T.H. Fraser.

(4) *Micronecta griseola* Horváth, 1899 (Insecta, Heteroptera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2519. A. Jansson.
(5) *Corixa albifrons* Motschulsky, 1863 (Insecta, Heteroptera): designation of neotype. Z.N.(S.) 2520. A. Jansson & I.M. Kerzhner.
(6) Non-marine mollusca of Madeira. Z.N.(S.) 2521. H.W. Waldén.
(7) What's in a (sub-specific) name? Z.N.(S.) 2522. R. Fortuner.
(8) *Oncomera* Stephens, 1829 (Insecta, Coleoptera): proposed designation of *Dryops femorata* Fabricius, 1792 as type species. Z.N.(S.) 2523. V. Suihla.
*(9) *Phaulacridium vittatum* (Sjostedt, 1920) (Insecta, Orthoptera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2524. K.H.L. Key.

(d) *Guidelines for applications to the Commission.* Intending applicants should draw up their applications in line with the Guidelines published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature,* volume 42, part 1. pages 3–5. Copies of the Guidelines can be obtained from the Executive Secretary.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

CHANGES IN TRUST MEMBERSHIP

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature announces with regret that Sir Eric Smith, CBE, FRS has relinquished his membership of the Trust. The Trust expresses its warm thanks to Sir Eric for much help and encouragement during his seven years of membership.

The Trust has pleasure in announcing the election of the following new members:

Dr P.F.S. Cornelius (British Museum (Natural History), London, U.K.)
Dr M.K. Howarth (British Museum (Natural History), London, U.K.)
Dr R.B. Manning (National Museum of Natural History, Washington D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)

RETIREMENT OF MR. R.V. MELVILLE AS SECRETARY

Mr Richard V. Melville retired from the Secretaryship of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the conclusion of the XXII General Assembly of I U B S at Budapest on 7 September 1985. Mr Melville, who had been successively Chief Palaeontologist and Assistant Director to the Institute of Geological Sciences (now the British Geological Survey), was Secretary of the Commission for more than 17 years.

His association with the Commission began more than 30 years ago. He played a prominent part in the 1953 Copenhagen Colloquium and the International Congress of Zoology Section on Nomenclature, assisting Secretary Hemming to prepare the daily summaries of the proceedings. In addition, he verified and saw through to publication the 'Copenhagen

Decisions' – described by Secretary Hemming as "that indispensible work of reference to all systematists".

In May 1958, Mr Melville was seconded from the Geological Survey and Museum for 18 months as Assistant Secretary of the Commission in order to be Secretary of the London Colloquium and Congress Section on Nomenclature and of the Editorial Committee of the 1st Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature.

In 1968, Mr Melville was elected a member of the Commission and appointed its Secretary. Outstanding amongst his many achievements as Secretary and Editor of the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature have been the preparation of some 500 Opinions, the handling of the Appeal for Funds to ensure the Commission's survival, and his secretaryship of the Editorial Committee culminating in the publication, earlier this year, of the 3rd Edition of the Code.

The zoological community as a whole owes a great debt to Richard Melville for his dedication to zoological nomenclature and the wisdom and skill which he has shown in administering the Commission's affairs. His experience and scholarship will be greatly missed within the Secretariat and by the Council but will continue to be available within the Commission through his continuing membership as a Commissioner.

Richard Melville's many friends in zoology will wish him health in a long and well-earned retirement.

As a result of changing requirements in the management of the Commission's affairs, and with the agreement of the Management Committee of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, the duties of the Secretary of the Commission and of the Scientific Controller of the International Trust are being rearranged.

Dr Philip Kingsley Tubbs, MA, PhD (Cambridge), has been appointed Executive Secretary of the Commission and will be responsible for the management of its affairs. An Honorary Secretary of the Commission will be appointed from the Commission to fulfil statutory requirements.

Dr Tubbs is a Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and a former University Lecturer in Biochemistry in the University of Cambridge. Dr Tubbs brings to the Secretariat the experience of long association with the Commission of Enzyme Nomenclature of the International Union of Biochemistry and membership of the Editorial Board of the Biochemical Journal and of the Biochemical Society's Publications Advisory Committee. He has a long-standing interest in Lepidoptera.

W.D.L. RIDE
President
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
September 1985

CLOSURE OF CERTAIN FILES

The backlog of several hundred files is being reviewed as time permits. A number of files are found no longer to have any meaning because the problems they present are now capable of automatic resolution. The following files have accordingly been closed:

Z.N.(S.)	
104	*Eunice* Cuvier, 1817 for Official List
326	*Anidanthus* Whitehouse, 1926, type species for
598	*Nyctalemon* Dalman, 1825, for Official List
702	Brisson, 1760, *Ornithologia,* status of names in, see Direction 21
791	Thirty-two generic names in Polyzoa for the Official List
795	*Terado senegalensis* Blainville, 1824 and *T. petiti* Récluz, 1849, status of
800	Martini & Chemnitz, *Neues systematisches Conchylien-Cabinet,* availability of generic names in, see Opinion 182
801	*Rhynchonella* Fischer de Waldheim, 1809, for Official List, see Opinion 190
818	'-ites' names, validation of certain
819	'-crinus' and '-crinites' names, validation of
860	*Dipoeneura* Lioy, 1864 and *Aneurina* Lioy, 1864, validation of
886	*Holoplagia* Enderlein, 1912, alleged misidentified type species
941	*Astrea* Lamarck, 1801, spelling of
953	Song birds, family-group names of
957	*Corbicula* Megerle, 1811, family-group name for
966	*Aonyx* Lesson, 1827, for Official List
968	*Cynictis* Ogilby, 1833, for Official List
976	*Potos* Geoffroy & Cuvier, 1795, correct names for type species
1000	Hemiptera, Heteroptera family-group names in, see Opinions 244, 245, 281
1002	Subjective synonyms, declaration on
1040	Rafinesque's family-group names in Mollusca, for Official List
1043	*Kurtzia* Rybowski & Grockowski, 1898, proposed conservation
1063	*Hinnites* Defrance, 1821, spelling of
1067	*Benthodesmus* Goode & Bear, 1882, proposed designation of type species
1181	Martyn, 1784, *The Universal Conchologist,* status of names in, see Opinion 456
1190	Siphonaptera, family-group names in
1199	Linnaeus's Coleoptera Lamellicornia names, for Official List
1204	Fabricius's Coleoptera Lamellicornia names, for Official List
1213	*Atylenchus decalineatus* Cobb, 1913, neotype designation
1232	Porifera, proposed conservation of certain specific names
1234	*Sciurus cinereus* Linnaeus, 1758, for Official List
1235	Bryozoa specific names, for Official List
1256	Mallophaga specific names, for Official List
1384	*Eurete* Semper, 1868, gender of
1401	Foraminifera, family-group names in
1404	*Erebia cassioides* (Reiner & Hohenworth, 1792), identity of
1434	Nematode names, for Official Lists and Indexes
1476	*Tinocallis zelkovae* Dshibladze, 1957 and *T. zelkowae* Takahashi, 1919, declaration on secondary homonymy
1605	*Lithocolletis* Hübner, 1825, proposed validation
1816	*Hippurites flabellifer* Cragin, 1893, proposed suppression
2034	ARENARIIDAE Stejneger, 1885, proposed validation
2132	*Ectopistes migratoria* (Linnaeus, 1766), proposed conservation
2156	*Nessiteras rhombopteryx* Scott & Rines, 1975, a scientific name for the Loch Ness Monster

R.V. MELVILLE *August 1985*

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 51c OF THE CODE. Z.N.(S.)2474

(see vol. 41, pp. 149–150; vol. 42, pp. 10–12)

(1) By Brett C. Ratcliffe (*University of Nebraska State Museum; Past President, the Coleopterists Society*)

I am very much opposed to the idea of no longer using parentheses as provided for in Article 51c. Parentheses serve a utilitarian purpose by indicating the changed generic status of a name originally proposed in another genus. This is a valuable tool in tracing the nomenclature of a beast as well as the historical usage of its name by others. In some groups, such as many vertebrates, where the taxonomy and nomenclature are well established, this may not be so important. With insects and other invertebrates, however, alpha level taxonomy is on the cutting edge of our knowledge about these animals, and tools such as parentheses are helpful in our understanding of their taxonomy. I strongly urge the retention of parentheses.

(2) By J. R. Vockeroth (*Biosystematics Research Institute. Canada*)

I agree wholeheartedly with the proposal by Gagné, Thompson & Knutson that the requirement that parentheses be used with the name of an author of a species-group name in any generic combination other than the original, be deleted from the Code.

The information conveyed by the use of parentheses is very limited and of value only to those (primarily taxonomists) who may wish to determine the original combination or examine the original description; I feel, therefore, that the time spent in ensuring that parentheses are used in accordance with the requirement of previous codes of nomenclature is unjustified.

Since 1965 the publication of several regional catalogues of Diptera (and by 1990 it is probable that all species will have been catalogued) has made the information mentioned above readily available for most species of the order; for this group, the use of parentheses is, or soon will be, nearly superfluous. I do not know whether other groups are as well served, but think many are or soon will be.

Of far more value to those who wish to determine original combinations or examine original descriptions is the date of publication of a species-group name — *X-us albus* Smith, 1850 gives much more useful information than *X-us albus* (Smith). I approve of the wording of Article 22 of the Code: ‘Citation of the date of publication of a name is optional . . .’ but would suggest that a third Recommendation be added:

‘Recommendation 22e. In works of significance in taxonomy the date of publication of each included species-group name should be given.’

(3) By R. W. Crosskey and others (*Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), London*)

[Signatories are at the end of this comment]

Gagné *et al.* (1984) have formally proposed to the Commission that the parenthesising of authors' names for species removed from their original genera should no longer be mandatorily required by the Code. Only opinions opposed to this have been published (BZN, 42, pp. 10–11). We wish to give the fullest possible support to Gagné *et al.* in their cause, and to note our disappointment that the new edition of the Code still enshrines this outmoded mandatory requirement. The parenthesising of authors' names is simply taxonomic ritual, sanctified by time, without sufficiently sensible purpose to justify perpetuation in modern taxonomy. It tells us that a named species no longer remains where its describer first placed it, that is all; it does not tell us whence it came, who translocated it or when, or how we can discover these things.

We agree with all that Gagné *et al.* have said about the practical inconveniences imposed by Article 51c; anyone who has had routinely to search out whether 'the author's name should be in brackets' for long lists of names to be issued in documentation of a non-taxonomic kind (e.g. in economic literature) will be fully acquainted with the futility of this particular form of time-wasting.

There are, however, other aspects not yet raised. We wish to call attention to these.

(1) Lumped and split classification. Whether an author's name is to be parenthesised rests on generic transfer, without regard to the existence of subgeneric names, even though generic and subgeneric names are coordinate. Name combination is the guiding principle, not transfer of actual animal taxa from one grouping to another. The effect of this is unfortunate, as it means that parentheses must come and go like a tennis-ball across the bracketing net when one school of taxonomists recognises many small genera in a refined classification and another school treats these as subgenera in a broad-genus classification. The literature then presents a baffling picture to the non-taxonomist, faced with seemingly haphazard and inconsistent treatment of authors' names.

(2) Non-taxonomic zoologists. Names and their attributes (authorship. dating, etc.) are part of the service industry provided by taxonomists for zoologists at large. The 'audience' for such names is wider today than it ever was, and taxonomy itself is moving far from its morphological roots into realms of chemotaxonomy, cytology, ethology, etc. where its practitioners function far removed from the mysteries of the Code — even if they know the Code exists. Taxonomists need good reason if they are to thrust mandatorily upon all zoologists such arcane requirements as that of Article 51c.

Conclusion. Most provisions of the Code have a role to play in ensuring the stability and universality of nomenclature that justifies their existence. Article 51c does not. It is impossible to show that it is essential in taxonomic practice. It says next to nothing of value either to taxonomist or non-taxonomist; it is an empty provision already widely disregarded. We urge the abolition of this misbegotten mandatory requirement.

REFERENCE

GAGNÉ, R. J., THOMPSON, F. C. & KNUTSON, L. V. 1984. International Code of Zoological Nomenclature: amendment proposed to Third Edition: proposal concerning Article 51c. Z.N.(S.)2474. *Bull. zool. Nomen.*, vol. 41, pp. 149–150.

The signatories to this comment are:
R. W. Crosskey (Diptera) and P. C. Barnard (Trichoptera), B. Bolton (Hymenoptera), D. J. Carter (Lepidoptera), M. C. Day (Hymenoptera), W. R. Dolling (Hemiptera), M. G. Fitton (Hymenoptera), I. D. Gauld (Hymenoptera), P. M.

Hammond (Coleoptera), K. M. Harris (Diptera), C. M. F. von Hayek (Coleoptera), D. Hollis (Hemiptera), J. D. Holloway (Lepidoptera), I. J. Kitching (Lepidoptera), R. B. Madge (Coleoptera), L. A. Mound (Thysanoptera), A. C. Pont (Diptera), R. D. Pope (Coleoptera), G. S. Robinson (Lepidoptera), K. Sattler (Lepidoptera), A. J. Shelley (Diptera), K. G. V. Smith (Diptera), R. T. Thompson (Coleoptera), A Watson (Lepidoptera), R. I. Vane-Wright (Lepidoptera).

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *TIBICINA* AMYOT, 1847 AND *LYRISTES* HORVÂTH, 1926. Z.N.(S.)239

(see vol. 41, pp. 163–184)

(1) By K. G. A. Hamilton (*Biosystematics Research Institute, Agriculture Canada, Ottawa, Ontario KIA OC6, Canada*)

This is actually a compound amendment, and must be treated in two parts, 2 and 3 below.

2. Suppression of TIBICENIDAE Van Duzee, 1916: it is abundantly clear that this name is causing confusion with TIBICININAE Distant, 1905, and some action must be taken to clear up this situation. Traditionally, fixation of at least a one letter spelling difference has been used to clear up cases of family-group homonymy, but in this case (probably unique) the names both appear in the same family, and therefore the confusion would still exist. Therefore alternative B of the proposal cannot be accepted under any circumstances. This does not signify approval of alternative A, which (for reasons cited under 3, below) must be accepted only as a last resort to alternative B. Three other alternatives must be considered first:

2a. Fixation of the stem of TIBICEN as TIBICIN–, and rejection of TIBICINIDAE Van Duzee, 1916 *non* Distant, 1905, under Article 53. Since this would suppress the name by homonymy rather than by declaring it unavailable, the status of *Tibicen* as a valid genus would not be affected.

2b. Rejection under the plenary powers of TIBICINIDAE Van Duzee, 1916, by declaration that that part of Van Duzee's work is suppressed for nomenclatural purposes. Again this would not affect the status of *Tibicen*.

2c. Suppression of TIBICININAE Distant, 1905, and of *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847 in favour of CICADETTINAE Buckton, 1890 and a new genus for the 5 species formerly placed in *Tibicina*.

3. Suppression of *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827: despite harrowing stories of the misuse of this name in the 1800's modern usage has fixed a consistent sense for *Tibicen*. To change it now, even for such a lovely name as *Lyristes*, would involve world-wide confusion, and would change the name of at least one well known species, the Dog–day cicada, *Tibicen pruinosa* (Say). Contrast this with *Tibicina*, which is applied to only 5 species, none of which are widely represented in the literature.

4. If none of the above proposals meet the approval of the ICZN, then I would reluctantly accept suppression of *Tibicen* (alternative A) in preference to fixation of the misspelled Van Duzee family-group name (alternative B).

(2) By Michel Boulard (*Ecole pratique des hautes Etudes et Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005 Paris, France*)

La Commission internationale de Nomenclature zoologique aura bientôt à se prononcer sur les statuts respectifs des noms de genre *Lyristes, Tibicen* et *Tibicina* ainsi que sur leurs dérivés du groupe-famille. Le Secrétaire de la Commission a fait paraître une étude détaillée à ce propos en concluant par la mise en présence de deux solutions dites "alternative A" et "alternative B" (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol 41 (3), pp. 180 et 181).

Parmi les interventions écrites qu'a suscitées l'exposé du problème et son traitement éventuel, le manuscrit du commentaire, que Monsieur K. G. A. Hamilton a envoyé au Bulletin m'a été transmis. Il a retenu mon attention et j'en remercie son auteur. Ce commentaire contient des propositions qui appellent de ma part certaines remarques et appréciations, que je donne ci–après à la suite de chacune des dites propositions retranscrites en italiques.

2) *L'alternative B n'est, en aucun cas, acceptable.*

Je partage entièrement cette opinion: l'existence, pour des taxa du groupe-famille différents, de deux noms ayant même radical est à bannir.

2a + 2b) *Rejeter* TIBIC(I)NIDAE *Van Duzee 1916 (sic) mais conserver* Tibicen

Sauf à respecter la question du radical, cette proposition n'est autre que celle avancée par China (1964). C'est une 'solution' en apparence seulement: elle est illégitime et ne résout rien en profondeur; j'ai déjà expliqué pourquoi (cf. *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 41 (3), pp. 176–177).

2c) *Supprimer* TIBICININAE *Distant, 1916 (sic) et* Tibicina *Amyot, 1847, en faveur de* CICADETTINAE *Buckton, 1890 (sic) et d'un nouveau genre à créer.*

Outre que là, on se trompe de cible au risque d'accroître l'imbroglio, cette double proposition n'est pas soutenable: d'une part *Tibicina* est un nom valide et correctement établi avec *C. haematodes* Scopoli, 1763 (espèce des plus anciennes et des mieux connues) pour espèce-type (cf. Amyot, 1847, *Ann. Soc. entomol. France (2), vol. 5, p. 154;* cf. *Kolénati, 1857, Bull. Soc. imp. Naturalistes Moscou,* Sec. Biol., vol. 30, p. 415; cf. Melville & Sims, 1984, *Bull. zool. Nom.*, 41 (3), p. 165 et, d'autre part, le taxon ainsi nommé est le genre–type, fixé et par tous reconnu, d'un taxon du groupe–famille qu'il définit — Articles 29 et 35b — depuis l'origine formelle de celui-ci: TIBICININAE Distant, 1905 (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (7), vol. 15, p. 304; *ibid.*, vol. 16, p. 22), ainsi que des taxa subordonnés. Il semble nécessaire de rappeler que ce taxon du groupe–famille a été implicitement fondé en 1847 (Amyot, op. cit., pp. 153–154) selon des critères de groupe, reconduits par Distant et toujours en vigueur, avec *Tibicina* comme premier taxon cité, suivi, entre autres, de *Cicadetta* (op. cit., p. 156). La Sous–famille des TIBICININAE — dont en toute logique et en vertu de l'article 23 d(i), on devrait attribuer la paternité à Amyot — englobe la tribu des CICADETTINI, Buckton, 1889 (*The Entomol.*, vol. 22, p. 270: 'CICADINAE').

Je profite de l'occasion offerte pour signaler que la référence 'Buckton, 1890' pour le groupe des Cicadettes, que l'intervenant reprend de Metcalf, Z.P., 1963 (*Gen. Cat. Homopt.*, fasc. VIII, part 2, p. 270), est une bévue de catalogue; laquelle apparaît moins grave toutefois que celle remarquée dans la citation: 'TIBICINNAE, Buckton, 1889' (op. cit., p. 1). Buckton, en 1889 (op. cit., loc. cit.), puis en 1890

(*Monograph of the British Cicadae or Tettigidae*, p. xxxiv) mentionne le genre *Cicadetta* comme exemple de sa tribu des 'CICADINAE' qui se trouve ainsi parfaitement définie dès 1889: son tableau est clair à ce sujet. Il est clair aussi que Buckton y oppose les 'CICADINAE' à un second ensemble de Cigales nommé, dualité symptomatique: tout d'abord 'TIBICINAE' (1889), loc. cit.), puis "TIBICENINAE" (1890, loc. cit.) mais, chaque fois, sans aucune diagnose ni support générique. Ces deux derniers termes, en vertu de l'article 11 alinea (e) du Code, sont des *nomina nuda* et comme tels inutilisables avec la référence Buckton.

3, avec implication du 2c) *Imposer* Tibicen *pour cause 'd'usage moderne' et de la faiblesse numérique en espèces de* Tibicina.

Se rendre à cette proposition serait dresser des tabous, dont la Science n'a nul besoin, et choisir l'action inquisitoriale. Ce serait oublier que le progrès scientifique repose, en partie, sur la rectification des erreurs, à partir du moment où celles-ci sont débusquées; le progrès n'a guère à ménager l'usage, surtout quand ce dernier est 'moderne' et donc d'installation relativement récente. Le rétablissement de *Cicada* dans son concept originel, après plus de 100 années de fourvoiement est, de ce point de vue, exemplaire. J'ai montré (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 41 (3), pp. 170–178) que maintenir *Tibicen* serait s'acharner à ne pas traiter le mal à la base, perpétuer la confusion, jeter un discrédit sur la taxonomie que ce terme se trouve galvauder: soit par méconnaissance des textes de Latreille, soit par application bornée d'un postulat d'écriture, toutes choses qui ont conduit (Kirkaldy, 1906; Van Duzee, 1914) à l'affubler d'une acception opposée à celle de sa conception! Nous avons vu où cela a mené... Imposer *Tibicen* ne peut être que nuisible à la stabilité de la Nomenclature. A l'inverse, *Lyristes* jouit de toute garantie taxonomique. La dénomination scientifique révisée: *Lyristes pruinosus* (Say) pour l'espèce populairement appelée 'the Dog–day Cicada' peut, certes, procurer quelque gêne, mais celle-ci sera momentanée et chez de rares spécialistes routiniers. La rigueur est à ce prix, elle ne prend pas en compte le confort personnel et temporaire. Quoi qu'il en soit, l'usage du mot *Tibicen* et de ses dérivés ne bénéficie pas de l'acceptation générale et se trouve en dehors des dispositions de l'article 40 (a) relatif à la conservation des noms.

Enfin, je suis contraint de souligner qu'une rectification nominative n'a rien à voir, non plus, avec le nombre d'espèces du taxon visé, c'est évident. A ce propos, je signale à notre collègue que, pour le genre *Tibicina* (sensu stricto, à type *C. haematodes* Scop.), l'on connait actuellement non pas 5, mais 14 espèces, révisées (11) ou décrites (3) par mes soins (1972, 1977, 1981, 1983); la méprise de l'estimé morphologiste tient, en partie, dans le méli–mélo dû à la conservation de *Tibicen*, sensu Van Duzee, par Metcalf! (cf. Boulard, 1972, p. 168, notamment).

4) *Accepter la suppression de Tibicen (alternative A).*

Ce serait, pour Mr Hamilton, le recours. Prenons-en acte: en fin d'analyse, supprimer *Tibicen* est la bonne solution.

Appendice: Addenda et Corrigenda

Dans ma contribution (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 41 (3), pp. 166–179 et 181–184) quelques coquilles, erreurs ou omissions n'ont pu être corrigées avant la parution. Je le fais ci–après:

Errata

p. 167, alin. 6, ligne 2, lire:. . . entrepris des recherches. . .
p. 168, note 2 en bas de page, ligne 2, lire:. . . mononymique', qui parut. . .
ibid., note 3 en bas de page, ligne 1, lire:. . . plus ou moins les cymbales;
p. 171, alin. 15, dernière ligne, lire: divagatoire.
p. 173, alin. 20, ligne 12:. . . affirmations non fondées.
p. 174, note 7 en bas de page: supprimer la dernière phrase.
p. 176, alin. 28, ligne 2, lire:. . . un an plus tôt. . .

Références omises:

DISTANT, W. L., 1905, Rhynchotal Notes.–XXXIII. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (7), vol. 16, pp. 22–35.
KIRKALDY, G. W., 1906. Current notes. *The Entomol.*, vol. 39, pp. 283–287.
KOLENATI, F., 1857. Homoptera Latreille, Leach. *in*: Meletemeta entomologica, *Bull. Soc. imp. Naturalistes Moscou*, Sec. Biol., vol. 30, pp. 399–429.
LATREILLE, P. A., 1802. Cicadaires; Cicadariae. *in:* Histoire naturelle générale et particulière des Crustacés et des Insectes (Suite à Buffon, vol. 3, pp. 256–263.
———1804. *Ibid.*, vol. 12, pp. 293–337.
OSHANIN, V., 1908. Verzeichnis der palaearktischen Hemipteren mit besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer Verteilung im Russischen Reiche. II. Homoptera. III. Lieferung. *Annuaire Mus. Acad. Zool. imp. Sci.*, vol. 13, pp. 385–492.

(3) By P. Lauterer (*Jílová 33, CS–639 00 Brno, Czechoslovakia*)

In the Cicadoidea the nomenclature of the best-known genera and of the higher categories based on them has for long presented a problem. The existence of the generic names *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827 (type species *Cicada plebeja* Scopoli, 1763) and *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847 (type species *Cicada haematodes* Scopoli, 1763) caused misunderstandings because the subfamily name TIBICININAE can be derived from each of them. Monsieur Boulard has carefully analysed the various possible solutions to this problem with ample citations from the literature.

I prefer the solution offered in Alternative A because: (1) it is not hostile to stability of nomenclature because many specialists currently use the names in this sense; (2) it removes the misunderstandings that arise from the co-existence of *Tibicen* and *Tibicina* and the homonymous family-group names based on them. I believe most specialists in Homoptera will prefer Alternative A.

PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *APHELINUS MYTILASPIDIS* LE BARON, 1870: REPLY TO AUSTIN *ET AL.* Z.N.(S)2320

(see vol. 39, pp. 73–76; vol. 40, pp. 70–71)

By David Rosen (*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Levi Eshkol School of Agriculture, Faculty of Agriculture, Rehovot 76–100, P.O. Box 12, Israel*)

I am not convinced by the arguments of Austin *et al.* I am afraid that their lack of appreciation of the problems of field biologists, typical of many museum scientists, would result, if adopted by the Commission, in far more than 'a slight amount of inconvenience', or even 'some initial inconvenience'.

The name *mytilaspidis* has been used in hundreds of biological, ecological and applied biological control papers. Systematists, myself included, would of course not find it difficult to adapt to its replacement by an obsolete name such as *albidus*. However, numerous field biologists all over the world, who do not read taxonomic papers unless they are forced to do so, would be confused. It would take them years to realise that the enormous amount of practical information on *mytilaspidis* should now be referred to *albidus*. How on earth would this 'undoubtedly stabilise the nomenclature'? What would be gained, except for the upholding of the Principle of Priority?

So, it is not out of sentimentality that I favor the junior (100-year-old) synonym in this case. It is only out of my concern for the users of systematic information, and for the respect that they may or may not have for the science and practice of systematics, that I recommend the suppression of *albidus* in favor of *mytilaspidis*. In my opinion the careless replacement of well-established names by long-forgotten senior synonyms would only serve to deepen the unfortunate rift between field biologists and some systematists. For the sake of systematics, let us not alienate those who depend on us for a stable nomenclature.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSAL THAT THE GENERIC NAME *CHROMIS* CUVIER, 1814 (OSTEICHTHYES) SHOULD BE MASCULINE. Z.N.(S.)2329

(see vol. 37, pp. 247–255)

(1) By Sven O. Kullander (*Swedish Museum of Natural History, Stockholm S–104 05, Sweden*)

I object to the proposal by Bailey and others because I consider it directed against stability of nomenclature and totally unwarranted. The case is of interest to me as a specialist working on South American CICHLIDAE. Most of the genera with names ending in *–chromis* are in this family. My opinion is based on the following considerations:

(1) Emery, 1975, has shown that (a) the gender of the Greek noun chromis is variable, at least in usage; (b) Cuvier treated the generic name *Chromis* as feminine when he established it, and (c) the gender of generic names ending in *–chromis* is to be determined from authors' statements or indications. He pointed out that almost uniform treatment of this name as masculine in the ichthyological literature does not make it necessary to refer the name to the Commission; *Chromis* is a major genus of the POMACENTRIDAE, where the nomenclature is already confused.

I agree with (a), (b) and (c) above and consequently feel that the problem has already been solved by Emery's 1975 paper, which has guided usage in the matter of the gender of *Chromis* for nearly ten years. Acceptance of the proposal by Bailey *et al.* would have a negative effect on stability and cast doubt on the ability of active working taxonomists to take nomenclatural decisions in accordance with the Code.

(2) Bailey *et al.* ask that *Chromis* be ruled to be masculine in line with prevalent usage, and that names ending in *–chromis* be ruled to be masculine because most such names are so treated. They say that unless unity is imposed, authors and

editors, and such users as ethologists and aquarists will experience difficulty. I do not find these arguments either logical or strong.

I agree that it is convenient that all generic names ending in *–ops* should be masculine, but such names are found throughout the animal kingdom. *Chromis* and names ending in *–chromis* are found only in a relatively small number of perciform fishes. The two cases are not comparable and the comparison of them by Bailey *et al.* is not valid. It would be more straightforward to rule that all generic names must be masculine.

(3) Bailey *et al.* make much of the fact that *Papiliochromis* Kullander, the only generic name ending in *–chromis* originally stated to be feminine, is invalid. I cannot accept this, because the alleged senior synonym cited by Bailey *et al.* is an unavailable name. Furthermore, *Papiliochromis* contains a species with a feminine adjectival name, *P. altispinosa* (see Kullander, 1981).

(4) Bailey *et al.* list six valid pomacentrid generic names ending in *–chromis*. These genera contain nine species between them. Since, according to their list, *Chromis* has over 50 species, it would be more logical to ask that all these names be feminine, rather than the reverse.

The 38 valid genera of cichlids listed by Bailey *et al.* with names ending in *–chromis* are mostly small. Only five of them have more then five species. One hundred and twenty-nine species are involved, but many have patronymic names or nouns in apposition. Moreover, as indicated by Bailey *et al.*, there is much nomenclatural shifting in the CICHLIDAE following recent revisions. I find no case for a change in the gender of *Chromis*. On the other hand, the secondary reports on these revisions offer an excellent opportunity for the publication of a manual of genders of cichlid names, which would be useful to those people that Bailey *et al.* think would find difficulties.

There are other gender problems in the CICHLIDAE that would make such a manual desirable, apart from the *–chromis* problem. Examples are: names ending in *–acara* from Amerindian Acará (masculine), usually treated as feminine; names ending in *–cara* from Greek cara (neuter), usually treated as feminine; names ending in *–odon* (masculine), occasionally treated as feminine or neuter.

To sum up: (a) *Chromis* Cuvier, 1814 is feminine under Article 30a(i) (2); (b) Emery's 1975 paper gives guidance in this matter. It was published in a widely distributed journal (*Copeia*) and no facts have emerged to show that his conclusions are incorrect; (c) it has not been shown that problems would arise from treating *Chromis* as feminine and names ending in *–chromis* as masculine where appropriate.

I therefore recommend that the Commission reject proposal 6(1) of Bailey *et al.* and the relevant part of 6(2).

ADDITIONAL REFERENCE

KULLANDER, S. O. 1981. The Bolvian (sic) ram; a zoogeographical problem and its taxonomic solution. *DCG–Inf.*, vol. 12, pp. 61–79.

(2) By Alan R. Emery (*National Museum of Natural Sciences, Ottawa, Canada*)

Bailey *et al.* have asked the Commission to rule that the gender of *Chromis* be masculine in spite of their admission that the correct gender under the Code is feminine, as pointed out by Emery, 1975. They also accept that only the name

Chromis is affected by Emery's conclusion; the gender of generic names ending in *–chromis* is determined by the original author's indications. They also agree that this is so because chromis is of variable gender and thus the gender of any name ending in that word is subject to the arbitrary decision of the author of the name. Only in cases where there is no indication of gender from any included specific name could there be confusion. But that case too is nicely governed by the Code, which provides that such names must be automatically masculine. This happens to be the gender Bailey *et al.* desire. They also established, with the help of a classical scholar, Dr H. D. Cameron, of the University of Michigan, that chromis may be either masculine or feminine.

2. Emery, 1975, pointed out that others, while accepting the correctness of his conclusions, did not agree with his course of action.

3. The essence of the request by Bailey *et al.* seems to be pragmatism. Thus, they say '. . . we may anticipate varied use in the future and needless difficulty for authors and editors alike' and '. . . the adjectival accorded to each new species in a genus ending in *–chromis* will vary with each author's view'.

4. They defend the view that there will be a dichotomy of gender used by noting the recent description of a cichlid genus, *Papiliochromis* Kullander, 1977, which the author chose to be feminine; a choice which, under the Code, was his to make. They also point to the fact that *Chromis* has been variously considered masculine or feminine through the years. Only two of the works they cite post-date Emery, 1975, and both use the masculine gender, as was usual before Emery's paper.

5. Bailey *et al.* defend their pragmatic stance by noting the numerous species (probably of the order of 500 or more) that have *–chromis* in their generic names, and whose endings could thus be affected. They imply that such instability will be an inevitable result of the strict application of the Code.

6. I disagree with that conclusion and believe that the rules of the Code are clear and do not promote instability for the following reasons:

(a) The Code states that, for names derived from words of variable gender, the original describer should state or indicate the gender to be used. Thenceforth the gender of that particular name is stable. If the gender is not stated or indicated by the author it is masculine by default. This rule also applies to compound words; thus any *–chromis* name for which the author did not fix the gender is masculine by default (Article 30a(i) (2)). This is not the case for *Chromis:* the decision was made by the original describer.

(b) It is not necessary to conclude that Kullander, 1977, was influenced by Emery, 1975, in choosing feminine for his new name *Papiliochromis*. He gives no reason for his choice and may just as easily have been influenced by the gender of the name of its closest relative, *Apistogramma* [correctly neuter, Ed.] as by Emery's paper, which he did not cite. Emery specifically stated: 'Several have worried that if *Chromis* is changed to feminine it could affect the nomenclature of other groups, such as the cichlids, particularly *Hemichromis* and *Haplochromis*, but these fears are unfounded because the gender of each generic name must be considered independently, based on the author's use. It happens that *Hemichromis* and *Haplochromis* remain masculine'.

(c) The fact that a generic name has fixed the ending of a specific name in no way makes that ending sacrosanct. If the species is found to belong more properly in another genus, it takes the ending appropriate to the gender of the new generic name. This may be inconvenient for non-taxonomists familiar with the old spelling, but it does not detract from the long-term stability of nomenclature. Bailey *et al.* chose a particularly unfortunate example in citing *Haplochromis* 'with approximately 300 species'. This genus has recently been restricted to only five species by Greenwood (1979, p. 317), one of the authors of Bailey *et al.* He suggested that the remaining species be transferred to other genera. He recommended transferring one particularly large assemblage from Lake Malawi to *Cyrtocara,* a genus with a non-masculine name. Thus the genus with the most contentious name (for Bailey *et al.*) is no longer relevant and all the species they hoped would not have the endings changed are liable to be changed anyway, and perhaps only temporarily.

7. Several criticisms of Emery (1975) by Bailey *et al.* can be rebutted:

(a) They wrongly claim that Emery regarded Desmarest, 1814, to be non-binominal. He specifically dated *Chromis* from that work, which he could not have done if he had regarded it as non-binominal. He cited non-binominal uses of *Chromis* by Browne, 1756 and of *Chromis* by Lacepède, 1802.

(b) They claim that Cuvier was inconsistent in his treatment of *Chromis* as feminine. I find no such inconsistencies. In 1814, in Desmarest, he referred seven species to the genus, but only two of their names (both new, and both feminine) are combined with *Chromis*; the others are combined with the names of the genera (*Labrus, Sparus*) from which they were transferred. Many species now placed in *Chromis* were described in *Heliases*, which is masculine.

(c) Emery did indeed note the use of feminine endings in the 1960 and masculine endings in the 1970 editions of Bailey *et al.* He refrained from pointing out the inconsistencies in gender endings in the 1960 edition.

(d) The spelling 'Desmarets' for 'Desmarest' was taken from a French work (Hureau & Monod, 1973, p. 424) because I had no access to the original work. 'Desmarest' is, of course, correct.

8. The proposal by Bailey *et al.,* 1980, dealing with an issue where the Code gives a clearly defined answer, can only lead to confusion and to further requests to except nomenclaturally impeccable names from the application of the Code. I therefore ask the Commission not to use the plenary powers to rule that *Chromis* and names ending in *–chromis* are masculine but to let the rules of the Code apply.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the diligent help of Dr R. Winterbottom in criticizing this manuscript. Part of this study was supported by a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council Grant to the author.

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

BROWNE, P. 1756 (2nd edit. 1759). *Civil and natural history of Jamaica*. London.

DEAN, B. 1916. *A bibliography of fishes*. Vol. 1, publications by authors A-K. New York, Amer. Mus. nat. Hist.

HUREAU, J. C. & MONOD, T., Eds. 1973. CLOFNAM I, vol. 1. *Checklist of the fishes of the north-eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean*. Paris (Unesco), 683 pp.

LACEPEDE, G. B. 1802. *Histoire naturelle des poissons,* vol. 3. Paris, Plassan.

COMMENT ON THE REVISED PROPOSALS FOR STABILISATION OF THE NAMES OF CERTAIN GENERA AND SPECIES OF HOLOTHUROIDEA Z.N.(S.)1782

(see vol. 39, pp. 29–35)

By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, RA 2300 Leiden, Netherlands*)

Parts (1), (2) and (3): In the cases *Acolpos* Brandt, 1835 vs. *Thymoscia* Pearson, 1914; *Trepang* Jaeger, 1833 vs. *Halodeima* Pearson, 1914; and *Gymnochirota* Brandt, 1835 vs. *Semperothuria* Deichmann, 1958, one wonders if it is really worth while using the plenary powers to save the junior of these pairs, all of which, if I understand the application correctly, are only in use as subgenera. Also the advantage of being able to use names as old as 1835 instead of those published in 1914 and 1958 seems quite great to me. If, however, usage is such that the strict adherence to the Principle of Priority would make chaos, I would favour the course by which the junior name is given precedence over the senior, rather than suppress the senior name outright.

Part (4) *Oncinolabes:* I am not greatly impressed by the arguments in favour of suppressing the specific name *mollis* Brandt, 1835. In the last 52 years its junior synonym has only been used 6 times (and 3 of these by the same author). Would it not be much simpler to follow the Rules and adopt the name *mollis* for the species, and not to go to all the rigmarole of having the (evidently) rather insignificant name *glabra* Semper, 1868, conserved?

Part (5) *Holothuria aethiops:* The same situation as in the previous case exists here, except that there are 10 publications (4 by the same author) in the last 50 years using the junior synonym.

Part (6) *Holothuria glaberrima:* If *glaberrima* Risso, 1827, is suppressed, then all usages of the name *Holothuria glaberrima* prior to the establishment of *Holothuria glaberrima* Selenka, 1867 should also be suppressed. The date of Risso's name is September 1827 (see Sherborn, *Index Anim.* 1800–1850, vol. 1, p. cviii; and Monod & Hureau, 1977, *Ann. Mus. Hist. nat. Nice*, vol. 5, p. 161).

I am not convinced, in any of these 6 cases, that a consistent application of the Principle of Priority is not the simplest, shortest and best way out of the problems.

COMMENTS ON THE REPORT ON *GLYPHIPTERIX* HÜBNER, [1825] Z.N.(S.)2115

(see vol. 41, pp. 250–253)

By J. D. Bradley (*Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London, U.K.*)
and K. Sattler (*British Museum (Natural History), London, U.K.*)

In his recent report on *Glyphipterix* Hübner, [1825], the Secretary of the Commission submitted a revised proposal for consideration by the Commission. His proposal hinges on the assumption that *Glyphipteryx* Curtis, 1827, is an emendation of *Glyphipterix* Hübner, [1825]; this assumption is demonstrably false.

The Secretary's report asserts that in 1827 Curtis knew Hübner's works when establishing the name *Glyphipteryx*, but this is not entirely correct. Curtis was certainly aware of Hübner's *Sammlung europäischer Schmetterlinge*, making frequent reference throughout his text to plates and figures in that work. However, in none of Curtis's folios published before 1835 is there a direct or indirect reference to the *Verzeichniss bekannter Schmettlinge*, which is the only work of Hübner relevant to this case. In 1835, that is eight years after the publication of *Glyphipteryx*, and subsequently, Curtis includes genera from Hübner's *Verzeichniss* in his synonymies. Moreover, in folio 563, published 1 September 1835, Curtis stated with reference to *Cynaeda* Hübner, [1825], *Verzeichniss*, p. 346, 'I indicated this peculiar insect as a Genus in my Guide, unconscious at that time of Hübner having done so before me. . .'. The *Guide* referred to was published in 1829—[1831], and the part relevant to this case appeared in [1831], four years after the publication of *Glyphipteryx*. In this *Guide* there is further indirect evidence to show that as late as 1831 Curtis was unaware of the existence of Hübner's *Verzeichniss*.

Curtis used the term 'Nobis' to indicate new taxa as well as emendations; however, in the latter case he invariably cites the emended name as well; for example '*Argyromiges* Nob. — *Argyromis* Ste.' (1829, folio 284) or '*Radiellus* Nobis. — *radiella* Hüb. Schmet.' (1826, folio 109). No such reference is made under *Glyphipteryx*.

In folio 535 (published 1 February 1835) Curtis accepted the name *Harpipterix* Hübner, [1825], *Verzeichniss*, p. 407, citing it exclusively (four times) in this spelling. Moreover, he specifically stated 'I have therefore adopted Hübner's name of *Harpipterix* (Scythe–winged)'.

The contention that *Glyphipterix* Hübner, [1825], and *Glyphipteryx* Curtis, 1827, were confused in the past, or are likely to be confused in the future, seems almost irrelevant as these taxa are widely separated in the classification of the Lepidoptera. Similar cases of close orthography exist in generic names elsewhere, and as there is no evidence of confusion in the current literature there is no justification to suppress *Glyphipteryx* Curtis, 1827.

In view of these facts we believe that this case is best resolved without recourse to the plenary powers, as outlined in our previous proposal in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 35, p. 72, which we re-submit in full for reconsideration by the Commission.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSALS TO REMOVE THE HOMONYMY BETWEEN CAECILIIDAE IN AMPHIBIA AND INSECTA (PSOCOPTERA)

Z.N.(S.)2333

(see vol. 40, pp. 124–128)

By Marvalee H. Wake (*Department of Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, U.S.A.*)

I support the initial proposal offered by R. A. Nussbaum and E. Mockford as published in vol. 40, pp. 124–128. The family names proposed by Nussbaum and Mockford have the utility of simplicity and discrete association with the members they represent. I see Smith & Polhemus' point about the absence of a nominal genus with the spelling implied by the family name CAECILIONIDAE, but find the arguments about potential problems less than compelling. The arguments for both the formal and vernacular names suggested by Smith & Polhemus pose spelling and pronunciation problems, and lack the clarity of association and discrete separation of the names proposed by Nussbaum & Mockford. While utility might not be the most impressive argument to nomenclatural purists, I can assure you that it has great appeal to those of us, who, as in this case, are the primary 'users' of such a classification.

OPINION 1328
BELEMNITES MUCRONATUS SCHLOTHEIM, 1813 (COLEOIDEA): CONSERVED AND NEOTYPE DESIGNATED

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) the specific name *mucronatus* Link, 1807, as published in the binomen *Belemnites mucronatus,* and all other uses prior to its use by Schlotheim, 1813, are hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy;

(b) all designations of type specimen hitherto made for the nominal species *Belemnites mucronatus* Schlotheim, 1813, are hereby set aside and specimen number kca 5/2 in the collections of the Niedersächsisches Landesamt für Bodenforschung, Hanover, BRD, is designated as neotype of that species.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Belemnitella* d'Orbigny, 1840 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Herrmannsen, 1846, *Belemnites mucronatus* Schlotheim, 1813 (Name Number 2269);

(b) *Belemnella* Nowak, 1913 (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent designation by von Bülow-Trummer, 1920, *Belemnites lanceolatus* Schlotheim, 1813 (Name Number 2270);

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *mucronatus* Schlotheim, 1813, as published in the binomen *Belemnites mucronatus,* and as defined by the neotype designated under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above (specific name of the type species of *Belemnitella* d'Orbigny, 1840) (Name Number 2979)

(b) *lanceolatus* Schlotheim, 1813, as published in the binomen *Belemnites lanceolatus* (specific name of the type species of *Belemnella* Nowak, 1913) (Name Number 2980).

(4) The family name BELEMNITELLIDAE Pavlow, 1914 (type genus *Belemitella* d'Orbigny, 1840) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 572.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1160

An application for the use of plenary powers to attribute *Belemnites mucronatus* to Schlotheim, 1813 and to designate a neotype in conformity with current usage was first received from Dr J. A. Jeletzky, then of the *Geological Survey of Canada, Ottawa*, on 8 September 1956. After a long period of correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 17 December 1963 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 21, pp. 268–302. Public notice of the possible use of plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* and to the statutory serials, six general and two palaeontological serials. The application was supported in general terms by Dr C. W. Wright (*London*), Mr R. V. Melville (*British Embassy, Paris*), Professor D. T. Donovan (*Hull University, U.K.*) and Dr C. L. Forbes (*University of Cambridge, U.K.*). Alternative proposals concerning the neotype selection were received from Mr N. B. Peake (*Norwich, U.K.*) & Dr. J. M. Hancock (*Kings College, London*) and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 22, pp. 343–345. Support for these proposals was received from Mr R. V. Melville and Mr C. J. Wood (*Geological Survey and Museum, London, U.K.*) and published in *Bul. zool. Nom.*, vol. 23, pp. 70–71. A further comment concerning the proposed neotype was received from Dr D. P. Naidin (*Lomonosov University of Moscow, USSR*) and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 28, pp. 131–138. A comment by Dr W. K. Christensen (*Mineralogisk-Geologisk Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*), Prof. Dr G. Ernst (*Institut für Paläontologie der Freien Universität Berlin*), Prof. Dr F. Schmid (*Niedersächsisches Landesamt für Bodenforschung, Hannover, BRD*), Dr M. G. Schulz (*Geol.-Paläont. Institut der Universität Kiel, BRD*) and Mr C. J. Wood (*Institute of Geological Sciences, London, U.K.*) offering alternative proposals to those of Jeletzky and Naidin for the designation of a neotype was published in *Geol. Jahrb.*, vol. A9, pp. 41–45. These were eventually drafted into a revised and updated application by the Secretary and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 141–145. Reasons for the rejection of the two previous proposals by Jeletzky and Naidin are given in the abstract preceding the application on p. 141. No other comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-month rule on Voing Paper (1984)59 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 144–145. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Willink, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Ride, Kraus, Corliss, Schuster, Bayer, Heppell (in part), Binder

Negative Votes — one (1) Dupuis.

Lehtinen was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Halvorsen and Savage.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'A much more sensible solution would have been to make the neotype for *Belemnites mucronatus* Link, 1807, as;

(1) then Link's name had not to be suppressed under the plenary powers;
(2) the valid specific name for the species would have been 6 years older, and thus less likely to have senior synonyms or senior homonyms;
(3) the specific name remains the same;
(4) Link's species is so vaguely described that any neotype material fits it, and as no type material of it is known to exist, the neotype selection could have been done without recourse to the plenary powers.

Of *Belemnites mucronatus* Schlotheim, on the other hand, we know that it is (at least partly) based on a species different from the one for which the name is used at present and which is represented by the neotype.

'The procedure adopted now is unnecessarily complicated. However, as it produces the desired solution I vote for it.'

Heppell: 'I vote for the proposals in this case but believe there should be a small emendation to the wording of paragraph 8(1)b. That used is appropriate only for cases where an existing holotype or lectotype designation is set aside by the Commission in favour of a new lectotype designation from the original type series. In cases of neotype designation it is usually necessary to show that all original material (including in this case the specimen(s) figured by Breynius and Faujas) has been lost or destroyed, and that the neotype is consistent with the original type material (whereas in this case the applicants state that the Breynius figures illustrate a species not even congeneric with *Belemnitella mucronata* auct.) In this case, therefore, it is obviously necessary not only to set aside the earlier designations of neotype by Jeletzky and by Naidin, but also to set aside all original type material extant or illustrated. For that reason I believe paragraph 8(1)b of the application should have read; 'to set aside all original type material and all designation of type material hitherto made...' and that this should be indicated in the published Opinion.' [This has been done. RVM]

'As the nominal species *B. mucronata* is now to be defined by the neotype designated under the plenary powers it would seem immaterial whether the name is attributed to Link, 1807, or to Schlotheim, 1813, except to indicate the date of its priority. I would have thought in those circumstances that the earlier attribution would have been preferable, but if the applicants are content that no other name published between 1807 and 1813 is likely to complicate the issue I am happy to acquiese in what seems to have become general usage.'

Dupuis; 'J'ai pris à la lettre l'argument selon lequel "stratigraphic nomenclature would be violently disturbed by the transfer of the term 'Mucronata zone' from a Campanian to a Maestrichtian zone". Pour

oeuvrer conformément a ce souci, il convenait, me semble-t-il, de se référer à un "topotype" provenant de la localité stratotypique de la zone à *mucronata*. Barrois, 1876 est cité comme l'auteur de cette "zone". La requête, telle qu'elle figure au *Bull.* 39: 141–145 ne permet cependant pas de juger s'il existe un rapport objectif entre le stratotype (if any) de Barrois et les stratotypes implicites d'Angleterre, de Russie ou d'Allemagne que l'on nous propose, avec autant de candidats néotypes pour *mucronata* que de nations. Il ne semble pas, au demeurant, que l'on ait recherché des matériaux de Barrois. Aussi longtemps qu'un candidat néotype ne proviendra pas de la localité stratotypique (vraisemblablement située dans le Bassin anglo-parisien) je resterai sourd à l'argument de "current usage", mis en avant pour la forme et aussitôt éclipsé par des considérations plus ou moins nationalistes.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on the Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Belemnella Nowak, 1913, *Bull. Acad. Sci. Cracovie*, Ser. B, 1913, pp. 393, 403–405

Belemnitella d'Orbigny, 1840, *Paléontologie française*, Terr. Crét., vol. 1 (Ceph), p. 59

BELEMNITELLIDAE Pavlow, 1914, *Mém. Acad. imp. Sci. St. Petersbourg*, vol. 21(4), p. 7

lanceolatus, Belemnites, Schlotheim, 1813, *Leonhard's Tasch. Min.*, vol. 7, p. 111

mucronatus, Belemnites, Schlotheim, 1813, *Leonhard's Tasch. Min.*, vol. 7, p. 111.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (84)59 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1328.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
20 February 1985

OPINION 1329

GALAGO CRASSICAUDATUS E. GEOFFROY, 1812 (PRIMATES, GALIGIDAE): NEOTYPE DESIGNATED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers all designations of type specimen hitherto made for the nominal species *Galago crassicaudatus* E. Geoffroy, 1812 are hereby set aside and the specimen described by Olson, 1980, is hereby designated as neotype of that species.

(2) The specific name *crassicaudatus* E. Geoffroy, 1812, as published in the binomen *Galago crassicaudatus.* and as defined by reference to the neotype designated under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2981.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2285

An application for the designation of a neotype for *Galago crassicaudatus* E. Geoffroy, 1812 was first received from Dr T. R. Olsen (now of *City University of New York, U.S.A.*) on 29 September 1978. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 9 October 1979 and published on 25 September 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.,* vol. 37, pp. 176–185. Public notice of the possible use of plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to six general and two specialist serials. The application was supported by W. F. H. Ansell (*St. Ives, Cornwall, U.K.*). No adverse comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month rule on Voting Paper (1984)60 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 181 At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — eighteen (18) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Willink, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Ride, Kraus, Corliss, Schuster, Bayer, Heppell

Negative Votes — two (2) Dupuis, Binder.

Lehtinen was on leave of absence. No votes were received from Bernardi, Cogger, Halvorsen and Savage.

The following comments were returned by Commissioners with their voting papers:

Dupuis: La requête mise aux voix concerne essentiellement des questions *taxinomiques*. Elle n'apporte que des informations nomenclatoriales insuffisantes (quelles sont les autres espèces et sous-espèces en cause? Quelle est l'espèce-type d' *Otolemur*? Quels sont le statut, l'auteur et la date de *garnettii*?). Elle ne donne aucune certitude taxinomique (Pourquoi, en 1951 encore, le spécimen de Londres était-il déterminé *garnettii*? Pourquoi, en 1963 encore, y avait-il des divergences quant à l'identité spécifique du crâne de Paris?). Des requérants, fussent-ils docteurs de 1979, peuvent certes estimer leurs avis taxinomiques plus déterminants que ceux de leurs devanciers. Ils doivent cependant, à l'instar de ceux-ci, avant de porter atteinte au statut des types, soumettre leurs éléments d'appréciation aux jugements de la collectivité zoologique sous une forme autre que celle d'une thèse plus ou moins microfilmable.

En ces conditions, j'estime qu'il n'y a pas matière à un vote de nomenclature et, à tout le moins, qu'on ne peut pas voter objectivement. Je vote toutefois contre, en considération de deux postulats de méthode et d'éthique: 1) un néotype constitue toujours un faux historique; 2) le BM (NH) possède assez de types et n'a nul besoin de s'enrichir d'un néotype contestable!

Binder: 'The holotype of *Galago crassicaudatus* E. Geoffroy is not lost and has been usable since it was established. We cannot start replacing old types just because somebody has a better specimen.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following is the original reference to a name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

crassicaudatus, Galago, E. Geoffroy, 1812, *Ann. Mus. Hist. nat. Paris,* vol. 19, p. 166.

The following is the original reference to the proposition of a neotype for *Galago crassicaudatus* E. Geoffroy, 1812:

Olsen, T. R. 1980. *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 37, pp. 182–183.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (84)60 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1329.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
20 February 1985

OPINION 1330
PRODORYLAIMUS ANDRASSY, 1959 (NEMATODA): TYPE SPECIES DESIGNATED

RULING — Under the plenary powers, all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Prodorylaimus* Andrassy, 1959, are hereby set aside, and the nominal species *Prodorylaimus longicaudatoides* Altherr, 1968 is designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The generic name *Prodorylaimus* Andrassy, 1959 (gender: masculine), type species by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Prodorylaimus longicaudatoides* Altherr, 1968, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with Name Number 2271.

(3) The specific name *longicaudatoides* Altherr, 1968, as published in the binomen *Prodorylaimus longicaudatoides* (specific name of the type species of *Prodorylaimus* Andrassy, 1959) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with Name Number 2982.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2129

An application for the use of plenary powers to designate a type species for *Prodorylaimus* Andrassy, 1959 was first received from Dr P. A. A. Loof (*Landbouwhogeschool, Wageningen, The Netherlands*) on 18 June 1975. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 9 October 1979 and published on 8 May 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 37, pp. 34–36. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and six specialist serials. Comment was received from Dr L. B. Holthuis (*in litt.*) and together with a reply from Dr Loof was incorporated in V.P. (1984) 7 as an alternative proposal. On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)7 for either Dr Loof's or Dr Holthuis's proposals. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 there were fourteen (14) affirmative votes for Dr Loof's proposals and nine (9) affirmative votes for Dr Holthuis's proposals. Two (2) Commissioners did not return their voting papers. Thus while Dr Holthuis's proposals received a minority affirmative vote and may be considered to have been rejected, Dr Loof's proposals received a majority smaller than two-thirds. A revote was therefore taken on Dr Loof's proposals alone.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month rule on Voting Paper (1984)61 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 36. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Hahn, Trjapitzin, Halvorsen, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Ride, Corliss, Schuster, Bayer, Heppell, Binder

Negative Votes — four (4) received in the following order: Brinck, Mroczkowski, Willink, Kraus.

Lehtinen was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Dupuis and Savage.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

longicaudatoides, Prodorylaimus, Altherr, 1968, *Limnol.,* vol. 6(2), p. 270

Prodorylaimus Andrassy, 1959, *Acta. zool. Acad. Sci. Hungaricae,* vol. 5, p. 196.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (84)61 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1330.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
26 February 1985

OPINION 1331

SPHAERIIDAE JEFFREYS, 1862 (1820) (MOLLUSCA, BIVALVIA) AND MICROSPORIDAE REICHARDT, 1976 (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): PLACED ON THE OFFICIAL LIST

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the generic name *Sphaerius* Waltl, 1838 and all subsequent uses of that name are hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The generic name *Microsporus* Kolenati, 1846 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Microsporus obsidianus* Kolenati, 1846, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2272.

(3) The specific name *obsidianus* Kolenati, 1846, as published in the binomen *Microsporus obsidianus* (specific name of type species of *Microsporus* Kolenati, 1846) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2983.

(4) The following family-group names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) SPHAERIIDAE Jeffreys, 1862 (1820) (type genus *Sphaerium* Scopoli, 1777) (Name Number 573);
(b) MICROSPORIDAE Reichardt, 1976 (type genus *Microsporus* Waltl, 1838) (Name Number 574).

(5) The generic name *Sphaerius* Waltl, 1838, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2164.

(6) The family-group name SPHAERIIDAE Erichson, 1845 (invalid because the name of its type genus has been suppressed under the plenary powers) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 504.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1892

An application for the removal of the homonymy of the family name SPHAERIIDAE in Mollusca and Insecta was first received from Dr Arthur H. Clarke (*National Museum of Natural Sciences, Ottawa*) on 20 June 1969. It was sent to the printer on 26 August 1969 and published on 7 April 1970 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 26, pp. 235–237. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials and to seven entomological serials. The application was supported by Mr D. H. Heppell (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 27, p. 130).

On 9 June 1971 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1971)15 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 26, pp. 235–236. At the close of the voting period there were fifteen affirmative votes and two negative votes. The latter were accompanied respectively by a comment (from Professor Tortonese) and a set of alternative proposals (from Dr Starobogatov) that caused me to re-examine the case and present a revised version of it in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, pp. 60–62 (published on 27 March 1975). Comments were published in vol. 32, pp. 201–204 and vol. 38, pp. 157–161.

On 12 March 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)19 in two parts, one dealing with the Molluscan names and the other with the Coleopteran names. In Part 1 they were invited to vote either for the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, p. 62, paragraphs (2)(a), (3), (7) and (8), or for those set out in paragraphs (1), (2)(b), (3)(b), (4)(b) and (5). At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 there were nineteen votes in favour of the first alternative and three in favour of the second. In Part 2 of V.P. (84)19 the members were asked to vote either for the proposals set out in vol. 32, p. 61, paragraphs (1), (2)(b), (4) and (5), or for those in vol. 38, p. 158, paragraphs (a) to (d). At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 there were ten votes in favour of each alternative.

The result of this vote was to decide the issue of the generic names involved, on which the Secretary and Dr Starobogatov had differing views, but not to resolve Dr Clarke's original problems of the homonymous family names. The decision so taken was published as Direction 117 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 42, pp. 43–45).

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)63 either for the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, p. 203 and on p. 62, paragraphs (2)(a), (2)(b), (4) and (5) or for those set out in vol. 38, p. 158, paras (a)–(d). At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

For the first alternative; — fifteen (15) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Willink, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Ride, Kraus, Corliss, Schuster, Bayer, Heppell, Binder

For the second alternative — four (4) received in the following order: Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Trjapitzin.

Lehtinen returned a late vote for the second alternative. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Halvorsen, Dupuis and Savage.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and Official Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

MICROSPORIDAE Reichardt, 1976, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32, p. 204

Microsporus Kolenati, 1846, *Melet. entomol.* vol. 5, p. 64
obsidianus, Microsporus, Kolenati, 1846, *Melet. entomol.* vol. 5, p. 64
SPHAERIIDAE Erichson, 1845, *Naturges. Ins. Deutschland*, Abth. 1, vol. 3, p. 38
SPHAERIIDAE Jeffreys, 1862 (1820), *British Conchology* vol. 1, p. 1
(Under Article 40b this name takes the date in parentheses of Cycladia Rafinesque, 1820, *Ann. gén. Sci. phys.* vol. 5, p. 318)
Sphaerius Waltl, 1838, *Isis* (Oken), 1838, column 272.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)63 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1331.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
26 February 1985

OPINION 1332

CALAMOECIA AUSTRALICA SARS, 1908 AND *CALAMOECIA AUSTRALIS* (SEARLE, 1911) (CRUSTACEA, COPEPODA): PROPOSALS TO REMOVE THE CONFUSION REJECTED

RULING. — (1) The request to use the plenary powers to suppress the following specific names for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy is hereby refused:

(a) *australis* Searle, 1911, as published in the binomen *Brunella australis*;
(b) *viridis* Searle, 1911, as published in the binomen *Brunella viridis*.

(2) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *australica* Sars, 1908 as published in the binomen *Calamoecia australica* (Name Number 2984);
(b) *australis* Searle, 1911, as published in the binomen *Brunella australis* (Name Number 2985).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2242

An application for the use of plenary powers to remove potential confusion between *Calamoecia australica* Sars, 1908 and *Calamoecia australis* (Searle, 1911) was first received from Dr I. A. E. Bayly (then of *Department of Zoology, Westfield College, London*, now of *Monash University, Victoria, Australia*) on 21 December 1977. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 15 April 1980 and published on 25 September 1980 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 37, pp. 165–166. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin*, to the statutory journals, to seven general and two specialist serials. No comment was received.

On 12 March 1984 the Commissioners were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)5 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 37, p. 166. At the close of the voting period on 12 June 1984 there were 15 affirmative and 8 negative votes and a less than two-thirds majority resulted. The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Willink: 'I don't see any reason to change one of the names as it seems to me that the two are different enough to keep them'.

Mroczkowski: 'I vote against because the names "australian" (latin: *australica*) and "southern" (latin: *australis*) are of different origin and meaning. Moreover, as the specific names *australica* and *australis* are not of the same origin and meaning, and are not variable spellings (Art. 58), the danger of confusion is minimal and the whole petition is groundless.'

Hahn: 'The words *australis* and *australica* differ in more than one letter and are easily distinguishable — I cannot see a confusion. If the

Commission would follow the application of Dr Bayly, hundreds of names would have to be suppressed, differing only in *-is* and *-ica*, and confusion would certainly follow. Therefore, I strictly vote no.'

Kraus: 'There is, apparently, sufficient difference between the two congeneric specific names *australica* and *australis*. Confusion may be easily prevented by a minimum of attention. Concrete cases of confusion are not mentioned in the application, and it is only referred to in the aspect of "obvious potential for confusion".'

Heppell: 'No case has been made that the "obvious potential for confusion" would be sufficient for the ICZN to lose any sleep over it. If we can cope with the abundant literature on both *Littorina littorea* and *L. littoralis* we can surely cope with *Calamoecia australica* and *C. australis*.'

A report on the case was prepared by the Secretary and circulated to the Commissioners at the time of the subsequent revote.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month rule on Voting Paper (1984)62 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 166. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — one (1) Alvarado

Negative Votes — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Willink, Trjapitzin, Halvorsen, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Ride, Kraus, Corliss, Schuster, Bayer, Heppell, Dupuis, Binder.

Lehtinen was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger and Savage.

Binder commented: 'The potential for confusion is not very great. Since the proposition was not accepted by a two-thirds majority vote of the Commission, it shows that the case is not convincing enough to justify an exemption of the rules and it should clearly be rejected.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

australica, Calamoecia, Sars, 1908, *Arch, math, Naturvidensk.*, vol. 29(7), p. 12
australis, Brunella, Searle, 1911, *Victorian Nat.*, vol. 27, p. 176

NOTE ON THE PROCEDURE ADOPTED IN THIS CASE

Although the proposals to place *australica, Calamoecia* and *expansa, Brunella* on the Official List and *australis, Brunella* and *viridis, Brunella* on the Official Index were rejected, an entry in the Official List is the only way in which the fact can be recorded that the specific names *australica* Sars, 1908 and *australis* Searle, 1911 have been considered by the Commission.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (84)62 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been rejected, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1332.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
26 February 1985

OPINION 1333
IPNOPS MURRAYI GÜNTHER, 1878 (OSTIECHTHYES): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the generic name *Lychnoculus* Murray, 1877 and the associated specific name *mirabilis* Murray, 1877, as published in the binomen *Lychnoculus mirabilis*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The generic name *Ipnops* Günther, 1878 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Ipnops murrayi* Günther, 1878, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2273.

(3) The specific name *murrayi* Günther, 1878, as published in the binomen *Ipnops murrayi* (specific name of the type species of *Ipnops* Günther, 1878) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2986.

(4) The family-group name IPNOPIDAE Jordan, 1923 (type genus *Ipnops* Günther, 1878) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 575.

(5) The generic name *Lychnoculus* Murray, 1877, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2165.

(6) The specific name *mirabilis*, Murray, 1877 as published in the binomen *Lychnoculus mirabilis*, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1153.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1393

An application for the conservation of both the generic and specific names *Ipnops murrayi* Günther, 1878 was first received from Dr G. W. Mead (then of *U.S. Department of Interior, Washington D.C.*) on 21 October 1958. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 31 January 1962 and published on 10 September 1962 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 19, pp. 295–296. Public notice of the possible use of plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin*, to the statutory serials, to seven general and one specialist serial. No comments were received.

Due to the problematical interpretation of Article 23b at that time, the case was never voted upon. In 1981 the case was rewritten and published on 11 March 1982 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 27–28. Public notice of the possible use of plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin*, to the statutory serials, to seven general and four specialist serials. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month rule on Voting Paper (84)42 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 28. At the close of the voting period on 13 December the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Schuster, Willink, Trjapitzin, Halvorsen, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Kraus, Ride, Corliss, Bayer, Heppell, Dupuis, Binder

Negative Votes — none (0).

Lehtinen was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger and Savage.

Ride commented: 'Although no evidence of usage of *Ipnops murrayi* is given beyond a general statement (Art. 79c), I accept that the Secretary has confirmed the statement and assume that a *prima facia* case is established'.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and Official Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

IPNOPIDAE Jordan, 1923, *Stanford Univ. Publ. Biol. Sci.*, vol. 3, p. 155

Ipnops Günther, 1878, *Ann. mag. Nat. hist.*, ser. 5, no. 8, 1878, p. 187

Lychnoculus Murray, 1877, *Science Lectures for the People*, ser. 9, vol. 4, p. 132

mirabilis, Lychnoculus, Murray, 1877, *Science Lectures for the People*, ser. 9, vol. 4, p. 132

murrayi, Ipnops, Günther, 1878, *Ann. mag. Nat. hist.*, ser. 5, no. 8, 1878, p. 187.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (84)42 were cast as set out above, that the proposal has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1333.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
27 February 1985

OPINION 1334
HARMINIUS FAIRMAIRE, 1851 (COLEOPTERA): TYPE SPECIES DESIGNATED

RULING — (1) Under the plenary powers, all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genera *Harminius* Fairmaire, 1851, and *Pseudocorymbites* Fiori, 1898, are hereby set aside, and the nominal species *Athous spiniger* Candèze, 1860, is designated as type species of both genera.

(2) The generic name *Harminius* Fairmaire, 1851 (gender: masculine), type species by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Athous spiniger* Candéze, 1860, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2274.

(3) The specific name *spiniger* Candéze, 1860, as published in the binomen *Athous spiniger* (specific name of the type species of *Harminius* Fairmaire, 1851 and *Pseudocorymbites* Fiori, 1898) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2987.

(4) The generic name *Pseudocorymbites* Fiori, 1898 (a junior objective synonym of *Harminius* Fairmaire, 1851 by reason of the ruling given under the plenary powers in (1) above) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2166.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2264

An application for the use of the plenary powers to designate a type species for *Harminius* Fairmaire, 1851, was first received from Dr E. C. Becker (*Biosystematics Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada*) on 2 May 1978. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 9 October 1979 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 37, pp. 49–50. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and seven specialist serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month rule on Voting Paper (1984)34 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 50. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Heppell, Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss

Negative Vote — none (0)

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence.

No votes were returned by Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Willink.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis; 'Would the indication of a neotype for *H. castaneus* not be simpler? What happens to that species anyway? Or is *H. castaneus* auct. considered a synonym of *H. spiniger*?' This comment was passed on to Dr Becker who pointed out that he was reluctant to select a specimen of *spiniger* (=*castaneus* auct.) because this species does not fit Fairmaire's description which described *H. castaneus* as an eucnemid, although subsequent authors classified it as an elaterid. Dr Becker further explained that he considered *H. castaneus* Fairmaire a *species dubia* and that *H. castaneus* auct. and *H. spiniger* would be impossible to synonymise due to the omission by most authors using '*castaneus*' to specify from where their specimens originated.

Dr Holthuis replied to these comments by pointing out the limitations in making *H. spiniger* the type of *Harminius*, as Fairmaire's description of this genus is also unlikely to fit that for the genus *Athous* for which Dr Becker wants to use it. It was further suggested that the Code should be followed and *Harminius* and *castaneus* used for the genus and species for which they were intended or else both considered *taxa dubia*.

Dr Holthuis also noted that by placing *H. castaneus* as a *species dubia* it remains a threat to later established names. Finally, it was suggested by Dr Holthuis that, as the type locality of *H. castaneus* Fairmaire is Sicily, authors who recognise two species of Italian *Harminius* auct. would use *H. castaneum* auct. for the Southern species (*H. spiniger*).

Dr Becker replied by stating that he did not know of any species from Sicily that would match Fairmaire's description of *H. castaneus*. However he was willing to designate a specimen of *H. spiniger* as neotype if the Commission demanded it, although he felt this would be inconsistent with Article 75d(4).

Dr Holthuis intimated that he did not want to force his ideas on Dr Becker and they were only meant as an easier solution to the problem. The present Opinion has therefore been prepared around the original proposals.

Mroczkowski: 'The generic name *Harminius* was described by Fairmaire one year earlier in November 1851 in *Rev. mag. zool. Paris*, (2), vol. 3, p. 527–528.' This has been incorporated into the present Opinion.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Harminius Fairmaire, 1851 *Rev. mag. zool. Paris*, (2), vol. 3, p. 527–528.

Pseudocorymbites Fiori, 1898, *Atti. Soc. Nat. Modena*, (3), vol. 16, p. 162
spiniger, Athous, Candèze, 1860, *Mem. Soc. r. Sci. Liége*, vol. 15, p. 460–461.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (84)34 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1334.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
28 February 1985

OPINION 1335
NEPA CINEREA LINNAEUS, 1758 (INSECTA, HETEROPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) the first reviser action of Esaki, 1926 is hereby set aside;

(b) it is hereby ruled that the specific name *cinerea* Linnaeus, 1758 is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the specific name *rubra* Linnaeus, 1758, whenever the two names are considered synonyms.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *cinerea* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Nepa cinerea,* with an endorsement that it is to be given precedence over *rubra* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Nepa rubra,* whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2988);

(b) *rubra* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Nepa rubra,* with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *Nepa cinerea* Linnaeus, 1758, whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2989).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2144

An application for the use of the plenary powers to conserve the name *Nepa cinerea* Linnaeus, 1758 was first received from Dr I. M. Kerzhner (*Zoological Institute, Leningrad*) on 4 September 1975. It was sent to the printers on 12 August 1980 and published on 30 April 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.,* vol. 38, pp. 138–141. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and nine entomological serials. No comment was received.

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984) 28 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, p. 140. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 there were fifteen (15) affirmative votes and (2) negative. During the voting Professor L. B. Holthuis questioned the total suppression of *Nepa rubra* and recommended the use of the relative precedence procedure. This proposition was put to Dr Kerzhner and he agreed. Accordingly V.P. (1984)28 was re-issued offering the choice of either republishing the case and giving public notice of the revised proposals suggested by Professor Holthuis or the more parsimonious alternative of voting directly on the relative precedence procedure, details of which were included in a paper circulated to all Commissioners. This voting paper was despatched on 13 September 1984 but at the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 some Commissioners had voted for both alternatives although they were mutually exclusive. This fact was brought to the attention of the Commissioners concerned and their votes adjusted accordingly.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)28 for or against the alternatives described above. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — eighteen (18) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Willink, Trjapitzin, Halvorsen, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Kraus, Ride, Corliss, Bayer, Dupuis, Binder

Negative Votes — one (1) Heppel.

Lehtinen was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Savage, Schuster and Uéno.

Heppell commented: 'If a majority of the Commission has already voted for paragraphs 9(1–3) of the application, the specific name *rubra* is rejected whatever action any second or subsequent 'reviser' may have taken. Paragraph 9(1) is merely stating what is implied in the action requested in paragraph 9(3) and a vote for 9(1) is an automatic consequence of voting for 9(3). It would be impossible to vote against 9(1) but for 9(3). Therefore Holthuis's objection seems quite groundless and this second vote totally unnecessary. The applicant has shown that *rubra* is either a synonym of *cinerea* or a *nomen dubium*. What possible reason can there be for preserving this name, for its use in the future in any sense can only be contrary to the stability of zoological nomenclature? Let us reserve the use of conditional suppression for those few cases where there is a genuine reason for caution owing to taxonomic uncertainty.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:
cinerea, Nepa, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.*, ed. 10, p. 440
rubra, Nepa, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.*, ed. 10, p. 440.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)28 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1335.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
30 April 1985

OPINION 1336

FIVE SPECIFIC NAMES PROPOSED AS NEW FOR THE GENUS *HETERODERA* A. SCHMIDT, 1871 (ASCHELMINTHES, NEMATODA) BY B. A. COOPER, 1955 RULED TO BE AVAILABLE

RULING. — (1) The request for the use of plenary powers to conserve *Heterodera urticae* Mathews, 1970, through the suppression of *Heterodera urticae* Pogosyan, 1962, is hereby refused.

(2) The specific names *bifenestra, limonii, methwoldensis, polygoni* and *urticae* as published in the binomina *Heterodera bifenestra, Heterodera limonii, Heterodera methwoldensis, Heterodera polygoni* and *Heterodera urticae* in the paper by B. A. Cooper, 1955, 'A preliminary key to British species of *Heterodera* for use in soil examination', pages 269–280, in D. K. McE. Kevan (Ed.) *Soil Zoology, Proceedings of the University of Nottingham Second Easter School in Agricultural Science*, Butterworth, are hereby ruled available for use in zoological nomenclature and placed on the Official List of Specific Names with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *bifenestra* Cooper, 1955, as published in the binomen *Heterodera bifenestra* (Name Number 2990);
(b) *limonii* Cooper, 1955, as published in the binomen *Heterodera limonii* (Name Number 2991);
(c) *methwoldensis* Cooper, 1955, as published in the binomen *Heterodera methwoldensis* (Name Number 2992);
(d) *polygoni* Cooper, 1955, as published in the binomen *Heterodera polygoni* (Name Number 2993);
(e) *urticae* Cooper, 1955, as published in the binomen *Heterodera urticae* (Name Number 2994).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2066

An enquiry into the status of five new nematode names was first received from Dr A. R. Stone (*Rothamsted Experimental Station, U.K.*) on 20 February 1974. The need for a ruling on the availability of these names was identified and a draft application was prepared and subsequently revised, at the request of Dr Stone, to incorporate a request for the use of plenary powers to suppress *Heterodera urticae* Pogosyan, 1962. The resulting draft was sent to the printers on 27 August 1974 and published on 31 December 1974 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 31, pp. 225–227. Public notice of the possible use of plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, seven general and one nematological serial.

Critical comments questioning the basis on which the names should be ruled unavailable were received from Dr L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, Netherlands*), Dr W. M. Watts and Dr S. Andersson (*DSIR, Auckland, New Zealand and National Swedish Institute* *for Plant Protection, Åkarp, Sweden*) and Dr R. M. Jeffords (*Houston, Texas, U.S.A.*) and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 32, p. 100, vol. 32, pp. 207–208 and vol. 33, pp. 69–70 respectively.

Support for the proposals was received from Dr J. F. Southey (*MAFF, Harpenden, U.K.*), Dr H. J. P. Mathews (*Ministry of Agriculture, Co. Antrim, Northern Ireland, U.K.*), Dr R. H. Mulvey (*Biosystematics Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada*) and Dr A. M. Golden (*USDA, Beltsville, Maryland, U.S.A.*)

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 27 September 1978 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month rule on Voting Paper (1978)25 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 31, pp. 226–227. At the close of the voting period on 27 December 1978 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — three (3) received in the following order: Tortonese, Welch, Kraus

Negative Votes — seventeen (17) received in the following order: Melville, Mroczkowski, Brinck, Holthuis, Eisenmann, Alvarado, Vokes, Willink, Habe, Binder, Corliss, Heppell, Bayer, Cogger, Nye, Dupuis, Bernardi.

Ride was on leave of absence, Sabrosky abstained. No votes were returned by Starobogatov.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Eisenmann: 'With some regret, I must agree with those objecting to the application that Cooper's 1955 names *are* available under the Code. This view would not preclude rejection of such names by exercising the plenary powers, if an application showed reasons such as maintenance of predominant usage, avoidance of confusion etc.'

Alvarado: 'I think that the names fulfil the requirements of Article 13a. The comments by L. B. Holthuis seem strong enough to me. In the Code there is a well established point: 'rules for nomenclatural purposes'. Taxonomy is another question.'

Bayer: 'I concur fully with the arguments against this proposal raised by Holthuis, Watts & Andersson, and Jeffords.'

Cogger: 'I agree with the comments made by the application's opponents, notably those of Jeffords. Recognition of Cooper's names does not raise a nomenclatural problem but rather a taxonomic one which can be solved by taxonomic specialists using the conventional methods of systematic zoology.'

Heppell: 'The comments against the proposals demonstrate that Cooper's specific names are available nomenclaturally, even if they are *species inquirendae* taxonomically. It seems farcical to me that if the Commission rejects this application it is obliged to enter such names on the Official List of Specific Names which is thereby reduced to a mere index of its decisions.'

Kraus: 'A decision by the Commission is necessary as the question of the availability of Cooper's names evidently is a source of controversy. I feel that the original author (Cooper) as well as the editor (Kevan) expressly did not have the intention to introduce new names in 1955. There is no necessity to place doubtful names (for *species inquirendae*) on the Official List.'

Nye: 'These names published by Cooper in 1955 fulfilled the requirements of the Code and were thereby established.'

Bernardi: 'Les noms de Cooper me semblent utilisables au sens du Code.'

Depuis: 'Ce vote est conforme à l'avis recueilli auprès de M. Michel Luc, spécialiste en phytonématodes.'

Sabrosky: 'It seems to me that many of the comments do not correctly consider the real point of the application, indeed the application itself does not do justice to the problem. It is not a question of the importance of the names, of usage, of Pogosyan's apparent misidentification, of the editor's note, nor the obvious undesirability of the method. The real point lies in a question of principle. Are such names as those of Cooper to be recognized as available?

'I concede that *if* the Cooper (1955) names are considered to be conditional names in the sense of the Code (Art. 17(8) 2nd ed., Art. 15 3rd ed.), then they are available. The fundamental question is whether they are truly conditional names or whether they are merely names used 'as temporary means of reference and not for formal taxonomic use as scientific names in zoological nomenclature'. This was the fundamental question addressed in my application (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 29, pp. 131–134, 1972) regarding the interpretation of the Code provision 'names proposed for other than taxonomic use'. (Art. 1 2nd ed.).

'If Cooper's names were to be voted available, I maintain that that action would be inconsistent with Art. 1b(6) the provision of which now appears to be consistent with a decision of the International Congress of Zoology.

'The Bradley Draft, to review the background, gave expression to a Copenhagen Decision (p. 63, para. 114) as Art. 1, Sec. 2; 'A Latin or latinized designation of an animal shall be assumed to be a name for use in zoological nomenclature unless its author, in publishing it, made it clear that such was not his intention.' This was further stated in the Bradley Draft Art. 6, Sec. 6a: 'Extra-nomenclatural names. — If it is clear that a given name was not intended for use in zoological nomenclature, it shall not be available and shall lack status for any nomenclatural purpose.' The 2nd edition of the Code expressed this concisely — in retrospect too concisely — as 'names proposed for other than taxonomic use, are excluded' [from zoological nomenclature, Art. 1]. The 3rd edition of the Code has somewhat expanded the expression in an attempt to be more meaningful: 'as temporary means of reference and not for formal taxonomic use as scientific names in zoological nomenclature'.

'In all these expressions and in the cases that are involved, obviously there are *names* involved. Obviously there is some kind of taxonomic use, since names must be intended to separate 1 from 2, or a from b, etc, but they may not be for 'formal taxonomic use'. Even vernacular names can have taxonomic use of a sort. Obviously the real question must be the clarity of the author's statement of his usage of 'names'.

'In the case of Cooper's names, I am convinced that he made it abundantly clear that he was not proposing the names for formal use. (See quotations from Cooper in Sabrosky, *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 29, p. 131; unfortunately Stone did not quote Cooper's most significant sentences). Cooper himself made clear his use of inverted commas; it was not an editorial insertion as Jeffords thought possible (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 33, p. 69).

'The argument on "conditional names" apparently stems from Secretary Melville's use of that expression, as quoted by Stone (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 31, p. 226.). I consider that incorrect (Cooper said "provisional" and not "conditional") and particularly unfortunate because it immediately focused attention (Holthuis and others) on the "conditional proposal rule" for names proposed before 1961, Code Article 17(8) 2nd ed.; 15 3rd ed. For example Jeffords (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 33, p. 69), who specifically stated that he had not read Cooper (1955), accepted the argument of Watts & Andersson, who accepted Melville's statement that Cooper's names were conditionally proposed. I consider it significant that Jeffords went on to say "it [the Code provision, Art 1 2nd ed., Art. 1b(6) 3rd ed.] should be applied only where an author clearly and explicitly states or demonstrates within a publication that the names are not intended for taxonomic use . . .". That is exactly what Cooper made clear (cf. quotations in Sabrosky, *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 29, p. 131), and I consider that his publication is a typical example of the problem before us.

'Truly conditional names, on the other hand, even though "provisional" in the sense that they are not adopted at the time of first publication, are nevertheless proposed for formal taxonomic use, if and when the taxon for which they are proposed should come to be regarded as distinct. They are not proposed as temporary means of reference. They are intended to be a permanent name, if and when needed, which is quite different from the Cooper and other names cited in my application'.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

bifenestra, Heterodera, Cooper, 1955, A preliminary key to British species of *Heterodera* for use in soil examination *in Soil Zoology, Proceedings of the University of Nottingham Second Easter School in Agricultural Science,* D. K. McE. Kevan (ed.), Butterworth, London, pp. 275, 278
limonii, Heterodera, Cooper, 1955, *ibid.,* pp. 273, 274, 275, 276, 278
methwoldensis, Heterodera, Cooper, 1955, *ibid.,* pp. 277, 279
polygoni, Heterodera, Cooper, 1955, *ibid.,* pp. 273, 276, 277, 279
urticae, Heterodera, Cooper, 1955, *ibid.,* p. 279.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (78)25 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly rejected under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1336.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
9 May 1985

OPINION 1337

SELKIRKIA COLUMBIA CONWAY MORRIS, 1977 DESIGNATED AS TYPE SPECIES OF *SELKIRKIA* WALCOTT, 1911 (PRIAPULIDA)

RULING — (1) Under the plenary powers, all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Selkirkia* Walcott, 1911 are hereby set aside and *Selkirkia columbia* Conway Morris, 1977 is hereby designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The generic name *Selkirkia* Walcott, 1911 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Selkirkia columbia* Conway Morris, 1977, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2275.

(3) The specific name *columbia* Conway Morris, 1977 as published in the binomen *Selkirkia columbia* (the valid name at the time of this ruling for the type species of *Selkirkia* Walcott, 1911) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2995.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2171

An enquiry concerning the nomenclature of certain Cambrian fossils was first received from Dr Simon Conway Morris (*Department of Geology, University of Cambridge*) on 8 March 1976. After a period of correspondence a formal application was received on 19 May 1976. After further correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 16 February 1978 and published on 31 July 1978 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 35, pp. 49–50. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to six general and two palaeontological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month rule on Voting Paper (1985)1 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, p. 50. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-three (23) received in the following order: Melville, Brinck, Holthuis, Savage, Lehtinen, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Schuster, Kraus, Cogger, Heppell, Bernardi, Dupuis, Ride

Negative Votes — none (0).

Late affirmative votes were received from Halvorsen and Binder.

Holthuis commented: 'The taxonomy of the three species is still very unsettled and uncertain. Furthermore none of the three seem to be of great importance in general, applied or popular science, and are not frequently used. Therefore it seems to me that there is no good reason not to apply the rules strictly. From the application it is not clear to what genus *Orthotheca major* Walcot, 1908 (and its synonym *Selkirkia gracilis* Walcot, 1911) are to be assigned, otherwise than that it is different from the genus containing *S. columbia*. Mr Melville (in litt.) informs me that this genus is the true *Orthotheca* Novak, 1877. In that case *Selkirkia* would disappear in synonymy and cause no harm. A new generic name then has to be coined for *S. columbia*. As that species received its specific name *columbia* very recently (1977), evidently without causing any confusion, why should a new generic name cause so much confusion that the plenary powers of the Commission are needed to avoid that? [This comment resulted in prolonged correspondence, via the Secretary, between Dr Holthuis and the applicant. This eventually resulted in Dr Holthuis changing his vote to 'for'. RVM].

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

columbia, Selkirkia, Conway Morris, 1977, *Special Pap. Palaeontology,* No. 20, p. 33

Selkirkia Walcott, 1911, *Smithson. misc. Collns.*, vol. 57(5), p. 120.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)1 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1337.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
10 May 1985

OPINION 1338

THRIPS RUFUS HALIDAY, 1836 (INSECTA, THYSANOPTERA); CONSERVED FOR THE TYPE SPECIES OF *APTINOTHRIPS* HALIDAY, 1836

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) The specific name *rufus* Haliday, 1836, as published in the binomen *Thrips (Aptinothrips) rufa* [sic] is hereby exempted from the application of the Principle of Homonymy and of Article 49:

(b) All type designations hitherto made for the nominal species *Thrips (Aptinothrips) rufus* Haliday, 1836, are hereby set aside and a specimen in the Haliday Collection, National Museum of Ireland, Dublin with the slide data, 'Haliday/Haliday Collection/N.M.I. 20.2.82', is hereby designated as neotype of that species;

(c) all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal taxon *Aptinothrips* Haliday, 1836, are hereby set aside and the nominal species *Thrips (Aptinothrips) rufus* Haliday, 1836, is hereby designated as type species of that taxon;

(2) The genus-group name *Aptinothrips* Haliday, 1836 (gender: masculine), type species by designation under the plenary powers in 1(c) above, *Thrips (Aptinothrips) rufus* Haliday, 1836, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2276.

(3) The specific name *rufus* Haliday, 1836, as published in the binomen *Thrips (Aptinothrips) rufa*, as conserved under the plenary powers in 1(a) above, and as defined by the neotype designation in 1(b) above, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2996.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2067

An application for the suppression of *Thrips rufa* Gmelin, 1790 so as to validate *T. rufa* Haliday, 1836 was first received from Dr L. A. Mound and Mrs J. M. Palmer (*Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), London*) on 2 April 1974. A revised draft was sent to the printers on 5 April 1974 and published on 31 December 1974 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 31, pp. 228–229. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to six general and seven entomological serials. Support was received from Dr K. O'Neill (*USDA, Beltsville, Maryland, U.S.A.*).

On 27 September 1978 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1978)26, for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom*, vol. 31, pp. 288–289. At the close of the voting period on 27 December 1978 the state of the voting was eighteen affirmative and two negative notes with one abstention. No Opinion was issued because of the comments of two members of the Commission. The comments were passed to the applicants who responded by drafting a new application which took into account the points raised in the comments. This revised draft was sent to the printers on 24 February 1981 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 36–39. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, six general and nine entomological serials. Comment was received from Dr L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden*) questioning the use of the term 'nomenclaturally valid'. The Secretary (*in litt.*) explained that a 'nomenclaturally valid' name is an available name that is neither a junior homonym nor a junior objective synonym. Dr Holthuis agreed with the definition but objected to its use until formally adopted by the Commission.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month rule on Voting Paper (1985)2 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 38–39. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Brinck, Savage, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Starobogatov, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Bayer, Heppell, Bernardi, Dupuis, Ride, Schuster

Negative — four (4) received in the following order: Holthuis, Lehtinen, Kraus, Cogger.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Halvorsen and Binder.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'I still have to protest about the use of the term "nomenclaturally valid" of which I still do not know the meaning, and which is neither used in the Code and certainly not in the Glossary.'

Cogger: 'While sympathetic to the basic proposal to conserve current usage of the long-standing *Thrips rufa* (sic) Gmelin, 1790, the solution proposed is both cumbersome and illogical, failing in its stated objective by associating the name with Haliday, 1836 rather than Gmelin, 1790. If "all subsequent [to 1836] authors have used the name *rufa* in the sense of Haliday but have referred to it as *'rufa'* Gmelin, 1790", I fail to see why its proposed association with Haliday, 1836 is less likely to "cause confusion among the many applied workers who use the name" than associating the name with Goeze, 1778! To suggest that the use of Gmelin's *rufa* is inappropriate (despite Article 18) while Haliday's *rufa* is not, defies logic. Few modern workers, especially applied ones, are likely to refer to the original descriptions. Further, the setting aside of the Principle of Homonymy, implicit in the proposal, is unwarranted and itself likely to lead to unnecessary confusion. Consequently I could support only the proposers' first suggestion, viz. designate a neotype for *Thrips rufus* Goeze, 1778, utilizing Haliday material.'

Heppell: 'I object to the terminology used in sections 1a and 3 of the proposals. Why is the expression "nomenclaturally valid" introduced? If this is intended to mean "enabled to be used as a valid name by removal of the known obstacles to the use of the name as a valid name", then we have the term "conserved name" (see Code Glossary). A name cannot be ruled to be "nomenclaturally" valid without altering the sense of the term "valid" as defined in the Code, where it is made explicit that a taxon may have only one valid name. I would also point out that "the specific name *rufa*" cannot in any case be a valid name for a species without contravening Article 5. Furthermore it seems unnecessary to use "combination" when binomen is clearly the term intended. The name of the subgenus is not part of the binomen and could be omitted here without loss.

'I also object to the stipulation "when corrected to *rufus*": this would seem to preclude the possibility of applying Article 34b if the species were for any reason transferred to a genus of feminine gender, as the proposal specifically excludes conservation of the feminine form. The specific name *rufa* should be placed on the Official List as in the original binomen, despite the incorrect gender assumed for the generic name: this would be in conformity with the Commission's precedents, e.g. the specific name *vulgare* (not *vulgaris*) was placed on the Official List as published in the binomen *Octopus vulgare*, even though *Octopus* is a genus of masculine gender.

'To avoid this misleading and periphrastic terminology, may I suggest that the Commission, if it accepts the proposals, should rule "that the specific name *rufa* Haliday, 1836, as published in the binomen *Thrips rufa*, is conserved for the purposes of the Principle of Homonymy". From this it surely follows that the name is not preoccupied by *Thrips rufa* Goeze, 1778, nor threatened by the provisions of Article 49.'

The Secretary replied: 'The fact seems to have escaped general notice that we use the term "valid" with two distinct meanings: there is the sense of "conserved", which may, and usually does, involve a factor of subjective synonymy, i.e. a conserved name is deemed to be taxonomically valid, and there is another sense (reflected in Hemming's use of "validated") of "nomenclaturally sound". I have been discussing this subject with Holthuis and the latest definition we have of a nomenclaturally valid name is that it is an available name that is neither (1) a junior homonym in the family group or the genus group, nor (2) a junior primary homonym in the species group, nor (3) a junior secondary homonym in the species group rejected before 1961, nor (4) a junior objective synonym, nor (5) a name that has been suppressed by the Commission. The great majority of available names fall into this category, and yet there is no place for it in the family tree in the Glossary to the Code.

'A name that fails any of the above tests is nomenclaturally (but not necessarily taxonomically) invalid — "objectively invalid" of the family tree — and cannot in any circumstances be used (plenary powers excepted). But a junior subjective synonym may well be nomenclaturally valid and can be used by anyone who does not accept the synonymy.

'You propose the term "conserved for the Principle of Homonymy" in your voting paper. I should prefer to retain "conserved" for cases with a subjective element and say "nomenclaturally validated" here. Until the name has been nomenclaturally validated it cannot be treated as a taxonomically valid name.'

Ride: 'I see no value in retaining a senior homonym of doubtful application merely on the grounds that it may one day be useful.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present opinion:

Aptinothrips, Thrips, Haliday, 1836, *Entomol. Mag.*, vol. 3, p. 445

rufus, Thrips (Aptinothrips), Haliday, 1836, *Entomol. Mag.*, vol. 3, p. 445.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)2 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1338.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
15 May 1985

OPINION 1339

PAPILIO FATIMA FABRICIUS, 1793 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA): RULED TO BE EXEMPT FROM THE APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLE OF HOMONYMY

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *fatima* Fabricius, 1793, as published in the binomen *Papilio fatima,* is hereby ruled to be exempt from the application of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *fatima* Fabricius, 1793, as published in the binomen *Papilio fatima* and as ruled to be exempt from the application of the Principle of Homonymy in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2997.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2351

An application for the conservation of the name *Papilio fatima* Fabricius, 1793 was first received from Dr G. Lamas (*Museo de Historia Natural, Lima, Peru*), Dr A. Aiello (*Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Balboa, Panama*) and the late Dr R. E. Silberglied on 18 June 1980. After considerable correspondence a revised manuscript was sent to the printer on 24 February 1981 and published on 11 March 1982 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 61–63. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and nine entomological serials. A comment was received from Dr L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden*) enquiring into the usage of the senior homonym *Papilio fatima* Cramer, 1780. This information was duly supplied by the applicants. Dr Holthuis also objected (*in litt.*) to the term 'nomenclaturally valid' on the grounds that the Commission had not yet formally adopted it. The Secretary pointed out that the term was meant as a simple expression for what the Commission does when it removes the nomenclatural (as distinct from taxonomic) obstacles to the use of a name as a valid name.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)4 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 62. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-three (23) received in the following order: Melville, Brinck, Holthuis, Savage, Lehtinen, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Kraus, Cogger, Heppell, Bernardi, Dupuis, Ride, Schuster

Negative Votes — none (0).

Halvorsen and Binder returned late affirmative votes.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'The nomenclatural obstacle to the validity of *Papilio fatima* Fabricius, 1793 is the presence of the available *Papilio fatima* Cramer, 1780. If the claim that making *Papilio fatima* Fabricius, 1793 nomenclaturally valid is removing the obstacles for this validity, then *Papilio fatima* Cramer, 1780 should be removed.'

Heppell: 'I agree with Commissioner Holthuis that the expression "nomenclaturally valid" is otiose, especially as in the new Code "conservation" has replaced "validation" in the statement of the Commission's plenary powers [Article 79a]. On the other hand I agree with the Secretary that *Papilio fatima* Cramer should not be suppressed. Conservation of *P. fatima* Fabricius for the purposes of the Principle of Homonymy sufficiently describes the action taken by the Commission. In my comments on the published draft of the new Code I argued for inclusion of "suppression for the Principle of Homonymy alone" among the Guiding Principles noted in Article 79b, for use in cases such as the present where stability of usage requires conservation of both primary homonyms. A precedent may be found in Opinion 685 where two specific names originally published as *Ammonites laevigatus* were both placed on the Official List. I believe both homonyms should be placed on the Official List so the status of each can be made clear. A parallel case is that of *Thrips rufus* (Opinion 1338)'.

Bernardi: 'Je vote pour, étant donné l'importance de *Anartia fatima* en systématique évolutive (biosystématique). Je veux noter que cette "tactique" portant sur la suspension du Principe d'Homonymie ne devrait être appliquée qu' à titre très exceptionnel: chez les Lépidoptères il existe de nombreux homonymes primaires décrits dans le genre *Papilio* désormais placés dans des genres ou des familles différents et leur "récupération" par suspension du Principe d'Homonymie serait une source d'instabilité, même si l'application stricte du Principe n'est pas générale ou seulement récente.'

Ride: 'I support Holthuis in wishing to avoid the term "nomenclaturally valid". "Valid" is defined in the Glossary of the Code in such a way as would extend the Opinion to cover matters that the application does not seek — namely that *fatima* would become valid in all circumstances, including taxonomic. I consider that we should be specific in a decision and suggest we "declare that *Papilio fatima* Fabricius, 1793 and *Papilio fatima* Cramer, 1780 are exempt from the operation of the Principle of Homonymy, i.e. they are not homonyms".'

ORIGINAL REFERENCE

The following is the original reference to the name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

fatima, Papilio, Fabricius, 1793, *Ent. syst.*, vol. 3(1), p. 81.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)4 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1339.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
15 May 1985

OPINION 1340
ATTUS OTIOSUS HENTZ, 1846 (ARACHNIDA, ARANEAE): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) the specific name *pulcher* Walckenaer, 1837, as published in the binomen *Attus pulcher*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

(b) the species-group names *pulcher pallida* Walckenaer, 1837, and *peregrinus* Walckenaer, 1837, as published in the trinomen *Attus pulcher pallida* and the binomen *Attus peregrinus*, are hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *otiosus* Hentz, 1846, as published in the binomen *Attus otiosus* is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names with the Name Number 2998.

(3) the specific and subspecific names *pulcher* Walckenaer, 1837, *pulcher pallida* Walckenaer, 1837, and *peregrinus* Walckenaer, 1837 as published in the combinations *Attus pulcher*, *Attus pulcher pallida* and *Attus peregrinus* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(a) and (1)(b) above, are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers 1154, 1155 and 1156 respectively.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2355

An application for the conservation of *Attus otiosus* Hentz, 1846 was first received from Dr G. B. Edwards (*Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, U.S.A.*) on 17 July 1980. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 24 February 1981 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 64–66. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case were given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and three arachnological serials. Support for the case was received from Dr Bruce Cutler (*Minnesota, U.S.A.*) and was published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 40, p. 19. No other comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)5 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 65. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Brinck, Holthuis, Savage, Lehtinen, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Schuster, Kraus, Heppell, Bernardi, Ride

Negative Votes — two (2) received in the following order: Cogger, Dupuis.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Halvorsen and Binder.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'On p. 65 of the application, in para. 4(1)(b) line 1 the words "specific names" should be read either as "specific and subspecific names" (as in para. 4(3), line 1) or as "species-group names". Under the present wording *pallida* will not be suppressed.' [This point was acknowledged by the Secretary and corrected in the present ruling].

Cogger: 'Neither the original proposal nor Dr Cutler's supportive comments convince me that the application of the Principle of Priority would cause such inconvenience as to justify the use of the plenary powers to suppress three species-group names.'

Ride: 'Relative frequency of usage alone is not sufficient to justify the use of the plenary powers. However, despite the fact that the action of Chamberlin & Ivie (1944) occurred before Art. 23b was introduced, the case is so obviously one for which Art. 23(b) was legislated to cover, that I consider the Commission is justified in treating it in that manner.'

Dupuis: 'L'indubitable filiation des travaux de Abbot (étude pionnière), de Walckenaer (classique de l'arachnologie) et de Chamberlin & Ivie (révision importante) me paraît devoir l'emporter sur la considération d'usages récents dans des "popular books".'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

otiosus, Attus, Hentz, 1846, *Boston J. nat. Hist.*, vol. 5, p. 356

pallida, pulcher, Attus, Walckenaer, 1837, *Histoire naturelle des insectes aptères*, Paris, vol. 1, p. 439

peregrinus, Attus, Walckenaer, 1837, *ibid.*, p. 445

pulcher, Attus, Walckenaer, 1837, *ibid.*, p. 439

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)5 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1340.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
15 May 1985

OPINION 1341
SIMULIUM AMAZONICUM GOELDI, 1905 (INSECTA, DIPTERA): NEOTYPE DESIGNATED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) all the original syntypes of *Simulium amazonicum* Goeldi, 1905, whether deposited in the British Museum (Natural History), Naturhistorisches Museum, Bern or elsewhere, and all subsequent designations of lectotypes from among those syntypes, are hereby set aside;

(b) the reared female specimen of *Simulium amazonicum*, deposited in the British Museum (Natural History) and whose data follows, is hereby designated as neotype. (*S. amazonicum* Goeldi, female, with associated pulpal pelt. BRAZIL: Amazonas, Bom Lugar, R. Purus. 8°42′S 67°22′W. 22.xi.1977 (*A. J. Shelley*)).

(2) The specific name *amazonicum* Goeldi, 1905, as published in the binomen *Simulium amazonicum*, and as defined by the neotype designated in 1(b) above, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2999.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2364

An application requesting the designation of a neotype for *Simulium amazonicum* Goeldi, 1905, was first received from Dr A. J. Shelley (*Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), London*) on 31 October 1980. A slightly revised draft was sent to the printers on 24 February 1981 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 67–70. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and nine entomological serials. Support for the case was received from Dr R. W. Crosskey (*Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), London*) and was published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 164–165. No other comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)6 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 69. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Brinck, Holthuis, Savage, Lehtinen, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Bayer, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Schuster, Kraus, Cogger, Heppell, Bernardi, Dupuis, Ride

Negative Vote — two (2) received in the following order: Cocks, Starobogatov.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Halvorsen and Binder.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'The request by the applicant "to suppress all the original syntypes" does not sound very nice. The Code, Art. 75, Rec. 75E, talks about to "set aside the existing type material"; this in my opinion, is much better and does not give the association of poor smashed blackfly types.' [This point was acknowledged by the Secretary and incorporated into the present ruling].

Cocks: 'Since syntypes are available, they should not be rejected. Surely nothing would be lost if the filarid-bearing vector species was arbitrarily assumed to be conspecific or otherwise.'

Bernardi: 'Excellent exemple de l'intérêt de la Recommandation 75E. Désormais depuis la nouvelle édition du Code, la "tactique" proposée pour cette Simulie en matière de matériel typique est à encourager'.

Dupuis: 'Dans le cas particulier, je surmonte ma réprobation pour la routine des néotypes car, (1) le choix d'un néotype plus complet — donc meilleur — que d'ordinaire illustre exemplairement l'importance des stades ontogénétiques dans l'identification des Insectes Holométaboles, et (2) la légalisation des types les plus complets me paraît aussi utile dans le cas des Simulies que dans celui des Chironomides (où l'Opinion 1147 — cf. *Bull. zool. Nom.*, 37, 1980, pp. 11–26 — a tranché en faveur de types complets). Je vote donc POUR, mais à condition qu'afin d'être clairement explicite l'on désigne comme néotype "the complete individual comprising the pupal exuvium together with the emerging female imago". Je voterais CONTRE, si l'on désignait seulement "the reared female specimen", accréditant ainsi, dans la forme, la pratique routinière de types réduits à un stade ontogénétique preférèntiel.' This comment was passed to the applicant who replied: 'The proposed neotype in the BM(NH) consists of a pinned female with its pupal pelt in glycerine. It is important to relate the pupal and adult stages in species of the *amazonicum* group because in some cases, e.g. *sanguineum, oyapockense, roraimense,* females can only be positively identified when associated with their pupal pelts.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following is the original reference to the name placed on an Official List by the ruling in the present Opinion:

amazonicum, Simulium, Goeldi, 1905, *Mems. Mus. paraense Hist. nat. Ethnogr.*, vol. 4, p. 138.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)6 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion. No. 1341.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
15 May 1985

OPINION 1342

DAMALIS PLANICEPS FABRICIUS, 1805 DESIGNATED AS TYPE SPECIES OF *DAMALIS* FABRICIUS, 1805 (INSECTA, DIPTERA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Damalis* Fabricius, 1805 are hereby set aside and *Damalis planiceps* Fabricius, 1805 is hereby designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The generic name *Damalis* Fabricius, 1805 (gender: masculine), type species by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Damalis planiceps* Fabricius, 1805, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2277.

(3) The specific name *planiceps* Fabricius, 1805 as published in the binomen *Damalis planiceps* (specific name of the type species of *Damalis* Fabricius, 1805) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3000.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2369

An application for the use of the plenary powers to vary the type species of *Damalis* Fabricius, 1805 was first received from Mr K. G. V. Smith (*Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), London*) and Dr M. Chvála (*Charles University, Prague, Czechoslovakia*) on 9 January 1981. It was sent to the printers on 24 February 1981 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 37, pp. 71–72. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, seven general and nine entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)7 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 72. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-three (23) received in the following order: Melville, Brinck, Holthuis, Savage, Lehtinen, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Schuster, Kraus, Cogger, Heppell, Bernardi, Dupuis, Ride

Negative Votes — none (0).

Late affirmative votes were returned by Halvorsen and Binder.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Brinck: 'The addition of an abstract of the application is — I think — very much appreciated by the public. Why not have abstracts constantly?'

Heppell: 'The details of the proposals are not consistent with the abstract. From the latter it is evident that the Commission is requested to validate the type designation of *Damalis planiceps* by Hull, 1962. It is all designations of type species prior to *that* act that should be set aside by the Commission's ruling'.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:
Damalis Fabricius, 1805, *Systema Antiliatorum*, p. 147
planiceps, Damalis, Fabricius, 1805, *ibid.*, p. 148.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)7 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1342.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
15 May 1985

OPINION 1343
KINOSTERNON ALAMOSAE BERRY & LEGLER, 1980 AND *KINOSTERNON OAXACAE* BERRY & IVERSON, 1980 (REPTILIA, TESTUDINES): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) the specific name *alamose* Pritchard, 1979, as published in the binomen *Kinosternon alamose*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy;

(b) the specific name *oaxacae* Pritchard, 1979, as published in the binomen *Kinosternon oaxacae*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy.

The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *alamose* Pritchard, 1979, as published in the binomen *Kinosternon alamose* (Name Number 1157);

(b) *oaxacae* Pritchard, 1979, as published in the binomen *Kinosternon oaxacae* (Name Number 1158).

The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *alamosae* Berry & Legler, 1980, as published in the binomen *Kinosternon alamosae* (Name Number 3001);

(b) *oaxacae* Berry & Iverson, 1980, as published in the binomen *Kinosternon oaxacae* (Name Number 3002).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2339

An application for the conservation of *Kinosternon alamosae* Berry & Legler, 1980 and *K. oaxacae* Berry & Iverson, 1980 by the suppression of *K. alamose* Pritchard, 1979 and *K. oaxacae* Pritchard, 1979 was first received from Mr P. C. H. Pritchard (*Florida Audubon Society, Maitland, U.S.A.*) and Mr N. Pronek (*T.F.H. Publications, New Jersey, U.S.A.*) on 12 March 1980 following correspondence between the applicants, Professor H. M. Smith (*University of Colorado, U.S.A.*) and the Secretary. A revised draft was sent to the printers on 21 January 1982 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 212–213. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and three herpetological serials. Supportive comments were received from Professor H. M. Smith (*University of Colorado, U.S.A.*), Dr J. F. Berry (*Elmhurst College, Illinois, U.S.A.*) and Dr J. B. Iverson (*Earlham College, Indiana, U.S.A.*). These were recorded in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 40, p. 71.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)8 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 213. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Brinck, Holthuis, Savage, Lehtinen (in part), Willink, Sabrosky, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Schuster, Kraus, Cogger, Dupuis

Negative Votes — four (4) received in the following order: Trjapitzin, Heppell, Bernardi, Ride.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Halvorsen and Binder.

The following comments were returned by Commissioners with their voting papers:

Lehtinen: 'Although supporting in principle the suggested use of plenary powers in the case, I see no reason to suppress *Kinosternon oaxacae* Berry & Iverson, 1979 in Pritchard, 1979. If this name too, will be suppressed, the Commission indirectly accepts the principle that the suppression of other more or less unintentionally but validly published names attributed to their correct authors, would be desirable by the use of the plenary powers. Parallel cases in other animal groups seem to be frequent, and as such present no threat to the stability of zoological nomenclature.

The name of this species, as published by Pritchard, 1979 and cited in the application seems to differ from that of Berry & Iverson, 1980, only by the year of the publication. Nothing will be gained through suppression of an earlier date, especially when the request for suppression of *K. oaxacae* was not argued by differences in interpretation of this taxon in 1979 and 1980. Characterization of this taxon in Pritchard's words cannot as such make it attributable to Pritchard, when the authorship of Berry & Iverson has been unequivocally cited.'

Bernardi: 'Je considère que les noms *Kinosternon alamose* et *K. oaxacae* de Pritchard sont des noms disponibles et leur rejet ne me semble pas necessaire'.

Ride: 'While most zoologists will sympathize with Pritchard in this situation, it is a situation that is not uncommon and one that the Commission has no power to correct. Application of the normal provisions of the Code do not, in this case, disturb stability, universality or cause confusion, the only conditions under which the Plenary Powers can be used.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

alamose, Kinosternon, Pritchard, 1979, *Encyclopedia of Turtles*. Neptune, N.J., T.F.H. Publ., p. 556

alamosae, Kinosternon, Berry & Legler, 1980, *Contr. Sci. nat. Hist. Mus. Los Angeles County* no. 325, pp. 1–12

oaxacae, Kinosternon, Pritchard, 1979, *ibid.*, p. 557

oaxacea, Kinosternon, Berry & Iverson, 1980, *J. Herpetol.* vol. 14, pp. 313–320.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)8 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1343.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
15 May 1985

OPINION 1344

MAYORELLA SCHAEFFER, 1926 GIVEN NOMENCLATURAL PRECEDENCE OVER *DACTYLAMOEBA* KOROTNEFF, 1880 (RHIZOPODA, AMOEBIDA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the generic name *Mayorella* Schaeffer, 1926 is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the generic name *Dactylamoeba* Korotneff, 1880, whenever the two names are considered synonyms.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Dactylamoeba* Korotneff, 1880 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Dactylamoeba elongata* Korotneff, 1880, with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *Mayorella* Schaeffer, 1926 whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2278);

(b) *Mayorella* Schaeffer, 1926 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Amoeba bigemma* Schaeffer, 1918, with an endorsement that it is to be given precedence over *Dactylamoeba* Korotneff, 1880, whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2279).

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *elongata* Korotneff, 1880, as published in the binomen *Dactylamoeba elongata* (specific name of the type species of *Dactylamoeba* Korotneff, 1880) (Name Number 3003);

(b) *bigemma* Schaeffer, 1918, as published in the binomen *Amoeba bigemma* (specific name of the type species of *Mayorella* Schaeffer, 1926) (Name Number 3004).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2387

An application for the conservation of *Mayorella* Schaeffer, 1926 was first received from Dr F. C. Page (*The Culture Centre of Algae and Protozoa, Cambridge, U.K.*) on 21 July 1981. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 24 January 1982 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 214–217. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials and seven general serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)9 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 215–216. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — eighteen (18) received in the following order: Melville, Brinck, Holthuis, Savage, Lehtinen, Willink, Sabrosky, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Bayer, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Schuster, Kraus, Cogger, Ride

Negative Votes — five (5) received in the following order: Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Heppell, Bernardi, Dupuis.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Halvorsen and Binder.

The following comments were returned by Commissioners with their voting papers.

Corliss: 'I have consulted a number of "rhizopod" specialists; they too are in favour of the proposals.'

Bernardi: 'Je considerè comme "trop complexe" le statut proposé pour le nom *Dactylamoeba* Korotneff, placé éventuellement sur la Liste Officielle des noms génériques mais jouissant pas du principe de priorité.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

bigemma, Amoeba, Schaeffer, 1918, *Trans. amer. micros. Soc.*, vol. 94, pp. 80–88
Dactylamoeba Korotneff, 1880, *Arch. Zool. exp. gen.*, vol. 8, p. 470
elongata, Dactylamoeba, Korotneff, 1880, *ibid.*, pp. 469–470
Mayorella Schaeffer, 1926, *Taxonomy of the Amebas*, p. 56.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)9 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1344.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
16 May 1985

OPINION 1345

LAOMEDEA FLEXUOSA ALDER, 1857, *SERTULARIA VOLUBILIS* LINNAEUS, 1758 AND *CAMPANULARIA JOHNSTONI* ALDER, 1856 DESIGNATED AS TYPE SPECIES OF *LAOMEDEA* LAMOUROUX, 1812, *CAMPANULARIA* LAMARCK, 1816 AND *CLYTIA* LAMOUROUX, 1812 (COELENTERATA, HYDROIDA) RESPECTIVELY

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Laomedea* Lamouroux, 1812 are hereby set aside and the nominal species *Laomedea flexuosa* Alder, 1857, is hereby designated as type species of that genus;

(b) all designations of type species for the nominal genus *Campanularia* Lamarck, 1816, other than that of *Sertularia volubilis* Linnaeus, 1758, by Naumov, 1960 are hereby set aside;

(c) all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Clytia* Lamouroux, 1812 are hereby set aside and the nominal species *Campanularia johnstoni* Alder, 1856, is hereby designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Laomedea* Lamouroux, 1812 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above, *Laomedea flexuosa* Alder, 1857 (Name Number 2280);

(b) *Campanularia* Lamarck, 1816 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation by Naumov, 1960, ratified by use of the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, *Sertularia volubilis* Linnaeus, 1758 (Name Number 2281);

(c) *Clytia* Lamouroux, 1812 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(c) above; *Campanularia johnstoni* Alder, 1856 (Name Number 2282).

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *flexuosa* Alder, 1857, as published in the binomen *Laomedea flexuosa* (specific name of the type species of *Laomedea* Lamouroux, 1812) (Name Number 3005);

(b) *volubilis* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Sertularia volubilis* (specific name of the type species of *Campanularia* Lamarck, 1816) (Name Number 3006);

(c) *johnstoni* Alder, 1856, as published in the binomen *Campanularia johnstoni* (specific name of the type species of *Clytia* Lamouroux, 1812) (Name Number 3007).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2326

An application for the conservation of *Laomedea* Lamouroux, 1812 was first received from Dr P. F. S. Cornelius (*Department of Zoology, British Museum (Natural History), U.K.*) on 19 July 1979. After some correspondence a revised draft with a request to vary the type species of *Laomedea* Lamouroux, 1812 was received on 17 July 1980. It was sent to the printer on 14 October 1980 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 38, pp. 208–220. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and three specialist serials. A comment was received from Dr L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden*) bringing to attention an earlier type designation for *Clytia* Lamouroux, 1812. Dr Holthuis also commented on use of the species name *hemisphaerica* by Houttuyn, 1770. These comments were passed to the applicant whose reply was published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 222–225. No other comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)11 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 216–217. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-two (22) received in the following order: Melville, Brinck, Holthuis, Savage, Lehtinen, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Schuster, Kraus, Cogger, Heppell, Bernardi, Ride

Negative Votes — one (1) Dupuis.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Halvorsen and Binder.

The following comments were returned by Commissioners with their voting papers:

Brinck: 'I agree with Dr Cornelius that it is unhappy that the phrase "les types de tous les genres" has been accepted as indicting type-designations.'

Heppell: 'It does not state on the voting paper whether or not the original proposals are modified by the notes published subsequently. The only point of substance, however, seems to be the date and authorship to be attributed to the designation of *Campanularia johnstoni* as type species of *Clytia*. In this case it certainly seems best to let the original proposal stand, and I accordingly vote for all previous designations to be set aside under the plenary powers in order that an unequivocally valid fixation of *C. johnstoni* as type may be made.'

Ride: 'Although it does not seem to make any difference to the application, I think that the author should re-examine his contention (1981, para. 10) that *C. (O.) poterium* is the type of *Orthopyxis* by monotypy. As I understand his statement, two other species were included in the same work (even if on a later page). Page priority in the same work does not confer any priority in date of publication unless the work was published over a range of dates.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Campanularia Lamarck, 1816, *Histoire naturelle des animaux sans vertèbres,* vol. 2, Paris, (Verdière), p. 112
Clytia Lamouroux, 1812, *Nouv. Bull. sci. Soc. philom. Paris,* vol. 3, p. 184
flexuosa, Laomedea, Alder, 1857, *Trans. Tyneside Nat. Fld. Cl.,* vol. 3, p. 122
johnstoni, Campanularia, Alder, 1856. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (2), vol. 18, pp. 359–360
Laomedea Lamouroux, 1812, *ibid.,* p. 184
volubilis, Sertularia, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. nat.,* ed. 10, p. 811.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)11 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1345.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
16 May 1985

OPINION 1346

CYTHEREIS DISTINGUENDA NEVIANA, 1928, *CYTHERE CRISPATA* BRADY, 1868 AND *CYTHERE PAVONIA* BRADY, 1866 (CRUSTACEA, OSTRACODA): TYPE MATERIAL CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under Article 75h the previously designated neotypes of *Cythereis distinguenda* Neviana, 1928, *Cythere pavonia* Brady, 1866 and *Cythere crispata* Brady, 1868 by Athersuch & Bonaduce, 1977, Athersuch, 1978 and Athersuch & Whittaker, 1980 respectively, are hereby ruled not to be name-bearing types and the designations of lectotypes for *Cythereis distinguenda* and *Cythere pavonia* and of a holotype for *Cythere crispata* are hereby ratified.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *distinguenda* Neviana, 1928 as published in the binomen *Cythereis distinguenda* and as interpreted by the lectotype designated by Athersuch, 1982. (Name Number 3008);
(b) *pavonia* Brady, 1866, as published in the binomen *Cythere pavonia* and as interpreted by the lectotype designated by Athersuch, 1982 (Name Number 3009);
(c) *crispata* Brady, 1868, as published in the binomen *Cythere crispata* and as interpreted by the holotype identified by Athersuch, 1982 (Name Number 3010).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2392

An enquiry as to the best procedure to be taken regarding the rediscovered type material of *Cythereis distinguenda* Neviana, 1928, *Cythere crispata* Brady, 1868 and *C. pavonia* Brady, 1866 was first received from Dr J. Athersuch (*BP Research Centre, Sunbury-on-Thames, U.K.*) on 30 September 1981. After some correspondence a draft application was received on 13 October 1981. This was sent to the printers on 11 May 1982 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 226–227. No plenary powers were involved and no comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)12 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 227. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-two (22) received in the following order: Melville, Brinck, Holthuis, Savage, Lehtinen, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Schuster, Kraus, Cogger, Heppell, Dupuis, Ride

Negative Votes — one (1) Bernardi.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Halvorsen and Binder.

The following comments were returned by Commissioners with their voting papers:

Cogger: 'There is no evidence in Brady's original description of *Cythere crispata* (reference to which is annoyingly omitted from the proposal) that Brady had before him only a single specimen. Indeed, use of the phrase "a re-examination of the specimens" while ambiguous (i.e. it could refer to specimens of *Cythere badia*), leaves the issue in doubt. Consequently without unequivocal reference to a single specimen in the original description, it would be more appropriate to designate the rediscovered type of *crispata* a lectotype rather than a holotype.' [This comment was forwarded to the applicant who replied thus: 'My reason for designating the rediscovered specimen of *Cythere crispata* Brady as a holotype rather than a lectotype is based on the fairly sound assumption that further specimens of the type series no longer survive.

'It is known that Brady's recent Mediterranean material is confined to the Hancock Museum, Newcastle, the BN(NH) London and to the Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches Scientifiques, Biarritz. A personal search of the collections of the first two institutions failed to recover further examples of this species, and documentary evidence of the collection in Biarritz (see *The Ostracodologist* 1970, No 16, p. 5) shows that no specimens survive here either.']

Heppell: 'The Commission does not have to ratify the designation of lectotypes and holotype as requested in paragraph 2. If the three neotypes are set aside the original types are reinstated.'

Bernardi: 'Je vote contre parce que:

'Cas "A" (*Cythere oblonga/Urocythereis distinguenda*): la suppression du néotype n'est pas utile, puisque ce néotype et l'éventuel lectotype sont conspécifiques et qu'ainsi ce changement de type ne précise aucun problème taxonomique; le sexe du lectotype éventuel ne pouvant même pas être déterminé avec certitude. Il est préférable de conserver le néotype comme support du nom.

'Cas "B" et "C" (*Cythere pavonia* et *Cythere crispata*); puisque la création des néotypes est jugée invalide par un des co-auteurs de la désignation, ces deux cas relèvent de l'Article 75(c) de la nouvelle édition du Code ("Cas exclus"). Ces deux néotypes n'ont donc "pas d'existence" et tout auteur est libre de désigner des lectotypes si la série typique est redécouverte, sans intervention de la Commission.

'L'ensemble des points discutés ici est d'un grand intêret car ils feront "jurisprudence" en matière d'application des nouvelles dispositions du Code à propos de types. Cela mériterait une discussion générale au cours d'un colloque ou autre réunion.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

crispata, Cythere, Brady, 1868, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.*, ser. 4, vol. 2, pl. 14, figs. 14, 15
distinguenda, Cythereis, Neviana, 1928, *Memorie Accad. pont. Nouvi Lincei,* ser. 2, vol. 11, p. 105
pavonia, Cythere, Brady, 1866, *Trans. zool. Soc. Lond.*, vol. 5(5), pp. 378–379.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)12 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1346.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
16 June 1985

OPINION 1347

ANTHALIA SCHOENHERRI ZETTERSTEDT, 1838 DESIGNATED AS TYPE SPECIES OF *ANTHALIA* ZETTERSTEDT, 1838 (INSECTA, DIPTERA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Anthalia* Zetterstedt, 1838 are hereby set aside and *Anthalia schoenherri* Zetterstedt, 1838 is hereby designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The generic name *Anthalia* Zetterstedt, 1838 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Anthalia schoenherri* Zetterstedt, 1838, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2283.

(3) The specific name *schoenherri* Zetterstedt, 1838, as published in the binomen *Anthalia schoenherri* (specific name of the type species of *Anthalia* Zetterstedt, 1838) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3011.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2380

An application for the use of the plenary powers to vary the type species of *Anthalia* Zetterstedt, 1838 was first received from Mr K. G. V. Smith (*Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), London* and Dr M. Chvála (*Charles University, Prague, Czechoslovakia*) on 18 May 1981. It was sent to the printers on 11 May 1982 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 220–221. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, seven general and nine entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)13 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 221. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-three (23) received in the following order: Melville, Brinck, Holthuis, Savage, Lehtinen, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Schuster, Kraus, Cogger, Heppell, Bernardi, Dupuis, Ride

Negative Votes — none (0).

Late affirmative votes were returned by Halvorsen and Binder.

Heppell commented: 'The details of the proposals are not consistent with the abstract. From the latter it is evident that the Commission is requested to validate the type designation of *Anthalia schoenherri* by

Melander, 1928. It is all designations of type species prior to *that* act that should be set aside by the Commission's ruling.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:
Anthalia Zetterstedt, 1838, *Insecta lapponica,* p. 538
schoenherri, Anthalia, Zetterstedt, 1838, *ibid.,* p. 539.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)13 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1347.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
17 May 1985

OPINION 1348
BOS GAURUS H. SMITH, 1827 (MAMMALIA, ARTIODACTYLA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the species-group name *guavera* Kerr, 1792 as published in the combination *Bos bubalus guavera,* is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *gaurus* H. Smith, 1827, as published in the binomen *Bos gaurus,* is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3012.

(3) the species-group name *guavera* Kerr, 1792, as published in the combination *Bos bubalus guavera* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1159.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2309

An application for the conservation of *Bos gaurus* H. Smith, 1827 was first received from Dr C. P. Groves (*Australian National University, Canberra*) on 4 July 1979. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 11 May 1982 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.,* vol. 39, pp. 279–280. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, seven general and four mammalogical serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)14 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 279–280. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-three (23) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Savage, Lehtinen, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Schuster, Kraus, Cogger, Heppell, Bernardi, Dupuis, Ride

Negative Votes — none (0).

Late affirmative votes were returned by Halvorsen and Binder.

The following comments were returned by Commissioners with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'The author's name Knox on the last line of p. 279 of the application (par. 4(3)) evidently is a misprint for Kerr.'

Lehtinen: 'Point (3) of the printed application includes an obvious but nomenclaturally essential lapsus or printing error. It should read: (3) to place the species-group name *guavera* Kerr, 1792, . . . not Knox, 1792.' [This misprint was noted by the Secretary and is corrected in the present ruling.]

Hahn: 'Apparently, the name *guavera* was first used by Pennant, 1781, not by Kerr, 1792 (". . . the description, as is usual with Kerr, is in fact only a paraphrase of Pennant"). Why then, under (1), is written *guavera* Kerr, 1792'? [The Secretary pointed out that although the description by Pennant does indeed predate that of Kerr, Pennant uses only a single vernacular name 'Guavera'. Kerr's description was the first to use an available binominal name].

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:
gaurus, Bos, H. Smith, 1827 *in Griffith's Cuvier, Mammals* vol. 4, p. 399
guavera, bubalus, Bos, Kerr, 1792, *Animal Kingdom,* p. 339.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)14 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1348.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
17 May 1985

OPINION 1349
ANTILOPE DEPRESSICORNIS H. SMITH, 1827 AND *ANOA QUARLESI* OUWENS, 1910 (MAMMALIA, ARTIODACTYLA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the species-group name *anoa* Kerr, 1792, as published in the combination *Bos bubalus anoa,* is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Names Numbers specified:

(a) *depressicornis* H. Smith, 1827, as published in the binomen *Antilope depressicornis* (Name Number 3013);
(b) *quarlesi* Ouwens, 1910, as published in the binomen *Anoa quarlesi* (Name Number 3014).

(3) The species-group name *anoa* Kerr, 1792, as published in the combination *Bos bubalus anoa,* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1160.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2310

An application for conservation of *Antilope depressicornis* H. Smith, 1827 for the Lowland Anoa and *Anoa quarlesi* Ouwens, 1910 for the Mountain Anoa was first received from Dr C. P. Groves (*Australian National Museum, Canberra*) on 4 July 1979. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 11 May 1982 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 281–282. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and five mammalogical serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)15 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 281–282. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-two (22) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Savage, Lehtinen, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Cocks, Starobogatov, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Schuster, Bayer, Kraus, Cogger, Heppell, Bernardi, Dupuis, Ride

Negative Votes — one (1) Mroczkowski.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Halvorsen and Binder.

Hahn commented: 'In this proposal Dr Groves calls the Mountain Anoa "*Anoa quarlesi* Ouwens, 1910". In Grzimek's Tierleben it is called "*Bubalus (Anoa) depressicornis fergusoni* (Lydekker, 1905)." Why is this older name substituted by the younger one (I am not familiar with *Beaufortia* 1969)?' [This question was relayed to the applicant who sent a xerox of his paper in *Beaufortia* which showed that Lydekker's name was associated with the Lowland Anoa and thus fell as a junior synonym of *Bubalus (Anoa) depressicornis* (H. Smith 1827)].

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

anoa, bubalus, Bos, Kerr, 1792, *Animal Kingdom,* p. 239

depressicornis, Antilope, H. Smith, 1827, *in Griffith's Cuvier, Mammals* vol. 4, p. 239

quarlesi, Anoa, Ouwens, 1910, *Bull. Dép. Agric. Indes néerl.,* vol. 38, p. 1.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)15 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1349.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
17 May 1985

OPINION 1350
CONUS ANTIQUUS LAMARCK, 1810 (MOLLUSCA, GASTROPODA): NEOTYPE SUPPRESSED

RULING — (1) The neotype designation of *Conus antiquus* Lamarck, 1810 made by Hall, 1964, *Boll. soc. paleont. ital.*, vol. 3, p. 129 is hereby suppressed.

(2) The specific name *antiquus* Lamarck, 1810, as published in the binomen *Conus antiquus* and as defined by the lectotype here designated, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3015.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2325

A request for the suppression of the neotype designation of *Conus antiquus* Lamarck, 1810 as a result of a rediscovered original specimen was first received from Dr A. J. Kohn (*University of Washington, U.S.A.*) on 22 October 1979. Due to the financial position of the Commission at the time, the application was not sent to the printers until 11 May 1982 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 283–284. No plenary powers were involved and no comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)16 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 283–284. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Savage, Lehtinen, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Starobogatov, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Schuster, Bayer, Kraus, Cogger, Heppell, Dupuis

Negative Votes — two (2) received in the following order: Bernardi, Ride.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Halvorsen and Binder.

The following comments were returned by Commissioners with their voting papers:

Bernardi: 'Je ne suis pas persuadé que la "procedure" proposée soit utile. Le néotype créé en 1964 par Hall semble remplir parfaitement son rôle de "support du nom". Ceci pose, comme pour l'Opinion 1346, un problème général: faut-il supprimer un néotype simplement parce que la série typique est redécouverte? A mon avis *non,* si cette activité n'apporte aucune précision taxonomique. Revalider sans raison taxonomique une série typique relève plus du "culte" des types que de la recherche scientifique si un néotype existe déjà.' [Article 75h gives the Commission the choice between confirming the neotype or validating the rediscovered type in such cases. Secretary].

Ride: 'My affirmative vote for a ruling "that the neotype . . . is not to be retained as a name-bearing type" (worded to conform with the 3rd Edn. Art. 75h) is conditional upon the Secretary confirming that the locality, horizon, etc., of the rediscovered syntype are sufficient for it to be useful'. [Monsieur B. Métivier of the *Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris* was contacted and asked for information concerning the type locality of the lectotype. Monsieur Métivier replied to the effect that the type locality was 'cône du Piémont'. Dr Ride's vote was thus changed to a negative one].

ORIGINAL REFERENCE

The following is the original reference for the name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:
antiquus, Conus, Lamarck, 1810, *Ann. Mus. Hist. nat.*, vol. 15, p. 439.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)16 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1350.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
20 May 1985

OPINION 1351
GALEOPSOMYIA GIRAULT, 1916 (INSECTA, HYMENOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the generic name *Trichaporus* Foerster, 1856 is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Galeopsomyia* Girault, 1916 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Euderus columbianus* Ashmead, 1888 (Name Number 2284);
(b) *Encarsia* Foerster, 1878 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Encarsia tricolor* Foerster, 1878 (Name Number 2285).

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *columbianus* Ashmead, 1888, as published in the binomen *Euderus columbianus* (specific name of the type species of *Galeopsomyia* Girault, 1916) (Name Number 3016);
(b) *tricolor* Foerster, 1878 as published in the binomen *Encarsia tricolor* (specific name of the type species of *Encarsia* Foerster, 1878) (Name Number 3017).

(4) The following names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers Specified:

(a) *Trichaporus* Foerster, 1856, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above (Name Number 2167);
(b) *Trichoporus* Ashmead, 1900, an incorrect subsequent spelling of *Trichaporus* (Name Number 2168).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2402

An application for the conservation of *Galeopsomyia* Girault, 1916 was first received from Dr J. LaSalle and Dr P. DeBach (*Division of Biological Control, University of California, U.S.A.*) on 14 January 1982. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 25 August 1982 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 297–301. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, seven general and nine entomological serials. A comment was received from Dr L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden*) and published, together with a reply from the authors, in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 40, pp. 73–74. The authors accepted the point raised by Dr Holthuis in point (2) of his comment and this has been incorporated into the present ruling. Support for the original proposals was received from Professor D. Rosen (*The Hebrew University, Rehovot, Israel*).

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)17 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 298–299 and as modified in vol. 40, p. 74. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-three (23) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Savage, Lehtinen, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Starobogatov, Brinck, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Schuster, Bayer, Kraus, Cogger, Heppell, Bernardi, Dupuis, Ride

Negative Votes — none (0).

Late affirmative votes were returned by Halvorsen and Binder.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

columbianus, Euderus, Ashmead, 1888, *Can. Entomol.,* vol. 20, p. 103
Encarsia Foerster, 1878, *Verh. naturf. Ver. preuss. Rheinl.,* vol. 35, p. 65
Galeopsomyia Girault, 1916, *Entomol. News,* vol. 27, p. 348
Trichaporus Foerster, 1856, *Hymenopterologische Studien, 2 Heft. Chalcididiae und Proctotrupini.* Ernst Meer, Aachen, p. 84
Trichoporus Ashmead, 1900, *in* Smith, J. R., Insects of New Jersey, *27th Annual Report State Board of Agr., Trenton.* Supplement, p. 561
tricolor, Encarsia, Foerster, 1878, *ibid.,* p. 66.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)17 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1351.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
20 May 1985

OPINION 1352
EURHINUS SCHÖNHERR, 1825 (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): RULED AS A JUSTIFIED EMENDATION OF *EURHIN* ILLIGER, 1807

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) it is hereby ruled that *Eurhinus* Schönherr, 1825 is a justified emendation of *Eurhin* Illiger, 1807.

(b) the generic name *Eurhynchus* Berthold, 1827 is hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Eurhinus* Illiger, 1807 (gender, masculine) type species, by monotypy, *Eurhin cupratus* Illiger, 1807 (as amended by Schönherr, 1825 and ruled under the plenary powers in (1) above to be a justified emendation) (Name Number 2286);

(b) *Eurhynchus* Kirby, in Kirby & Spence, 1828 (gender: masculine), type species by subsequent designation by Schönherr, 1833, *Eurhinus scabrior* Kirby, 1819 (Name Number 2287).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *cupratus* Illiger, 1807, as published in the binomen *Eurhinus cupratus* (specific name of the type species of *Eurhinus* Illiger, 1807) (Name Number 3018)

(b) *scabrior* Kirby, 1819, as published in the binomen *Eurhinus scabrior* (specific name of the type species of *Eurhynchus* Kirby, in Kirby & Spence, 1828) (Name Number 3019).

(4) The following family-group names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) EURHYNCHINAE (correction of EURHYNCHIDES) Lacordaire, 1863 (type genus *Eurhynchus* Kirby, in Kirby & Spence, 1828) (Name Number 576);

(b) EURHININI (correction of EURHINIDES) Lacordaire, 1866 (type genus *Eurhinus* Illiger, 1807) (Name Number 577).

(5) The generic name *Eurhynchus* Berthold, 1827, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2169.

(6) The generic name *Eurhin* Illiger, 1807 (ruled under the plenary powers in (1) above to be an unjustified original spelling) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2170.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2269

An application for a ruling on the homonymous use of family-group names based on *Eurhin, Eurhinus* and *Eurhynchus* was first received from Dr E. C. Zimmerman (*CSIRO, Canberra, Australia*) on 27 June 1978. Due to an unexpected complication at the level of the generic names involved there followed a long period of correspondence between the applicant, the Secretary and Mr R. T. Thompson (*Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History) London*). This resulted in the formulation by Mr Thompson of alternative proposals to those of Dr Zimmerman. Both drafts were sent to the printer on 25 August 1982 and published together in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 40, pp. 45–47 (Zimmerman) and pp. 47–52 (Thompson). Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and eight entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)19 either for the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, pp. 46 (Zimmerman) or for those on pp. 50–51 (Thompson). At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — Zimmerman — three (3) received in the following order: Hahn, Bayer, Cogger

Affirmative Votes — Thompson — seventeen (17) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Savage, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Starobogatov, Brinck, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Kraus, Heppell, Ride, Schuster

A negative vote for both sets of proposals was returned by Dupuis.

Late affirmative votes for Mr Thompson were received from Halvorsen and Binder.

Lehtinen abstained.

No vote was returned by Bernardi.

The following comments were returned by Commissioners with their voting papers:

Hahn: 'I think that it is not necessary to change the original spelling of *Eurhin* and *Eurhinus* only for the purpose of removing the homonymy. Therefore I vote for the proposal given by Dr Zimmerman. But, as in the case of *Scutellum* and *Scutella*, where the Commission has introduced SCUTELLUIDAE, I would prefer to call the name derived from *Eurhinus* EURHINUIDAE and not EURHINUSIDAE.'

Dupuis: 'Aucune des solutions proposées n'est satisfaisante, car tous les noms en cause sont essentiellement homonymes (n'en déplaise au Code), d'où persistance des confusions. Il eut fallu retenir la solution que préconisait déjà Latreille d'employer des noms vraiment distincts.'

Lehtinen: 'The choice between the parallel and simultaneously published applications of Zimmerman and Thompson is not the most satisfactory solution for this complex nomenclatural problem. The positive aspects of both applications should be combined to constitute a single application. The information given by Thompson is much more complete than that of Zimmerman, but, on the other hand, it seems also to show that in addition to Zimmerman, at least P. Vaurie, in her wide revisional work, has agreed that in the prevailing nomenclatural mess, the acceptance of the generic names that are valid according to the Code is the best alternative for the basis of names of family group too.

'Personally, I cannot accept the transfer of the validly published name *Eurhinus* Kirby, 1819 to be used for another genus by subsequent emendation of both of these names. A mess is a mess, in spite of any majority counts, and in such cases the Code should be followed rather than suggest complex rulings by use of the plenary powers for the generic names.

'There are various possibilities to solve the more theoretical problem of homonymy of the family-group names. The use of e.g. MACRORHINI instead of EURHININA or EURHININI in BARIDINAE could be chosen, but I prefer to leave the details of a revised application to specialists of Curculionoidea.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

cupratus, Eurhin, Illiger, 1807, *Magazin Insectenk.* (Illiger), vol. 6, p. 309
Eurhin Illiger, 1807, *Magazin Insectenk.* (Illiger), vol. 6, p. 309
EURHININI Lacordaire, 1866, *Histoire naturelle des insectes. Genera des coléoptères*, vol.7, p. 217, 220
Eurhinus, Illiger, 1807, *ibid.*, p. 309
EURHYNCHINAE Lacordaire, 1863, *ibid.*, vol. 6, p. 380, 527
Eurhynchus Kirby, in Kirby & Spence, 1828, *An introduction to entomology*, ed. 5, vol. 3, p. 324
Eurhyncus Berthold, 1827, *Latreille's natürliche Familien des Thierreichs aus dem Französischen*, p. 74
scabrior, Eurhinus, Kirby, 1819, *Trans. Linn. Soc. Lond.*, vol. 12(2), p. 428.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)19 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1352.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
20 May 1985

OPINION 1353

MYZUS FESTUCAE THEOBALD, 1917 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the specific name *festucae* Theobald, 1917, as published in the binomen *Myzus festucae*, is to be given precedence over the specific name *myrmecophilum* Theobald, 1916, as published in the binomen *Macrosiphum myrmecophilum*, whenever the two names are considered synonyms.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *festucae* Theobald, 1917, as published in the binomen *Myzus festucae*, with an endorsement that it is to be given precedence over *myrmecophilum* Theobald, 1916, as published in the binomen *Macrosiphum myrmecophilum*, whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 3020);

(b) *myrmecophilum* Theobald, 1916, as published in the binomen *Macrosiphum myrmecophilum*, with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *festucae* Theobald, 1917, as published in the binomen *Myzus festucae*, whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 3021).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2389

An application for the conservation of *Myzus festucae* Theobald, 1917 was first received from Dr H. L. G. Stroyan (*MAFF, Harpenden, U.K.*) on 2 September 1981. After some correspondence a draft was sent to the printers on 25 August 1982 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 40, pp. 53–55. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and nine entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)20 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, p. 55. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-two (22) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Savage, Lehtinen, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Cocks, Starobogatov, Brinck, Alvarado, Corliss, Uéno, Schuster, Bayer, Kraus, Cogger, Heppell, Bernardi, Dupuis, Ride

Negative Votes — none (0).

Late affirmative votes were returned by Halvorsen and Binder.

No vote was returned by Mroczkowski.

Bernardi commented: 'Je vote pour, mais ne serait-il pas plus simple de placer le nom *M. myrmecophilum* sur l'Index officiel des noms spécifiques rejetés et invalides en zoologie?'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:
festucae, Myzus Theobald, 1917, *Entomologist*, vol. 50, p. 80
myrmecophilum, Macrosiphum, Theobald, 1916, *ibid.*, vol. 49, p. 49.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)20 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1353.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
24 May 1985

BERYTUS FABRICIUS, 1803 (INSECTA, HETEROPTERA, BERYTIDAE): PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF *CIMEX CLAVIPES* FABRICIUS, 1777 AS TYPE SPECIES. Z.N.(S)2464

By W. R. Dolling (*British Museum (Natural History), London SW7 5BD, U.K.*)

The genus *Berytus* was founded by Fabricius, 1803, pp. 264–265, for two species, *Cimex tipularius* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Cimex clavipes* Fabricius, 1775. Fabricius 'indicated' *tipularius* as the type species of his new genus by giving an extended description of the genus following the name of this species. This is not now regarded as a valid method of type species designation but Reuter, 1888, p. 546, cited the bibliographic reference to *Berytus tipularius* of Fabricius, 1803, adding the words 'ut typus'. On page 548 of the same work, Reuter stated 'Typus generis *Berytus* Fabr. (1803) est *tipularius* L. (Vide supra)'.

2. The genus *Neides* was founded by Latreille, 1802, p. 246, for the same two species, *Cimex tipularius* Linnaeus and *Cimex clavipes* Fabricius. Eight years later, Latreille, 1810, p. 433, validly designated *tipularius* as the type species of *Neides*. The two genera were widely regarded as synonymous and the two species as congeneric until Fieber, 1859, monographed the family, placing *tipularius* in *Neides* and *clavipes* in *Berytus*; this action was legitimate at the time as no type species had yet been designated for *Berytus*. Reuter, 1888, pp. 546–548, attempted to reverse the application of the two generic names as used by Fieber but was not followed by subsequent authors, all of whom agree that *clavipes* and *tipularius* are not congeneric; the result of his actions was only to sink *Berytus* as a synonym of *Neides*, leaving *Berytus* sensu Fieber without a name.

3. Mulsant & Rey, 1870, established three new subgenera within *Berytus* sensu Fieber: *Melorus* (p. 212, for *Neides hirticornis* Brullé, 1835, with its synonym *Berytus pilicornis* Flor, 1862 and probable synonym *Berytus trichocerus* Scholtz, 1846); *Lizinus* (p. 212, for *Berytus montivagus* Meyer-Dür, 1841, with its synonym *Berytus rotundatus* Flor, 1862, and *Berytus signoreti* Fieber, 1859) and *Xanthocerus* (p. 224, for the two new species, *longicollis* and *gracilis*, and, dubiously, *Berytus angustipennis* Costa, 1860). No type species have ever been designated for any of these three subgenera; all three have been ignored by all subsequent authors. *Xanthocerus* Mulsant & Rey, 1870 is preoccupied by *Xanthocerus* Agassiz, 1845: p. 168, an emendation of *Xanthoceros* Newman, 1842, in Coleoptera.

4. Kirkaldy, 1900 p. 241, accepted that *Berytus* was a junior synonym of *Neides* and established the new genus *Berytinus* for *Berytus* sensu Fieber non Fabricius, designating as type species *Cimex clavipes* Fabricius, 1775. This name has been generally accepted by twentieth-

century authors. Under the provisions of the Code it should fall as a synonym of either *Melorus* or *Lizinus*.

5. Stichel, 1957, p. 44, established within *Berytinus* Kirkaldy the subgenus *Berytinellus*, citing as type species *Berytinus montivagus* Meyer-Dür, 1841. This subgenus is a subjective synonym of *Lizinus* Mulsant & Rey, as it includes all three species-group names eligible for designation as type species of *Lizinus*.

6. The name of the family BERYTIDAE is based on the generic name *Berytus* which, being a junior synonym of *Neides* at present, is not a valid name. Because of this, Southwood & Leston, 1959, pp. 7, 118, changed the name of the family to BERYTINIDAE. Under the provisions of Article 40(a) of the 1961 edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, such changes are to be maintained only if they had won general acceptance before 1961. This criterion obviously could not be satisfied for a name change proposed in 1959, so the family name remains BERYTIDAE based on *Berytus*, and not BERYTINIDAE, based on *Berytinus*.

7. The main problem of nomenclature involved is that the well-known Palaearctic genus *Berytinus* Kirkaldy (= *Berytus* sensu Fieber non Fabricius) should fall as a synonym of either *Melorus* or *Lizinus*, both of which names are completely unfamiliar to entomologists. *Berytus* Fabricius was legitimately restricted by Fieber, 1859, to *clavipes* and its allies and became a synonym of *Neides* Latreille only as a result of Reuter's (1888) fixation of *tipularius* as the type species of Fabricius's nominal genus. It is obvious from Reuter's work that he thought he was simply repeating Fabricius's invalid type designation but under Article 69(a) (iii) Reuter's action is a valid designation in its own right. Under Recommendation 69B(3) the species selected as type should have been *clavipes*. A secondary problem is that, if Reuter's type species designation is allowed to stand, the type genus of the family remains as a junior synonym. There are four possible courses of action, which I outline below; the last three of these require intervention by the Commission.

(1) The name *Berytinus* could be allowed to fall as a synonym of either *Lizinus* or *Melorus*.
(2) The name *Berytinus*, type *clavipes*, could be placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.
(3) The names *Lizinus* and *Melorus* could be suppressed and placed on the Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.
(4) The name *Berytus*, type *clavipes*, could be placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology and Reuter's type species designation could be set aside.

If course (1) were followed, the current name of the genus would be changed to an unfamiliar one and the type genus of the family would remain a junior synonym. If course (2) were followed, current usage would be preserved, *Melorus* and *Lizinus* would remain available for use as names of subgenera and the type genus of the family would remain a junior synonym. If course (3) were followed, the same situation would result except that these two names would not be available. If course (4) were followed, current usage would give way to an earlier, legitimate usage of a name familiar as the type genus of the family and *Melorus* and *Lizinus* would still be available for use as names of subgenera.

8. Accordingly, I ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Berytus* Fabricius, 1803, and, having done so, to designate *Cimex clavipes* Fabricius, 1775, as type species of that genus;

(2) to place the generic name *Berytus* Fabricius, 1803 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Cimex clavipes* Fabricius, 1775, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *clavipes* Fabricius, 1775, as published in the binomen *Cimex clavipes* (specific name of type species of *Berytus*, Fabricius, 1803), on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

Agassiz, L. 1845. *Nomenclator zoologicus. Coleoptera.* Solothürn. 170 pp.

Fabricius, J. C. 1775. *Systema Entomologiae.* Flensburgi & Lipsiae. p. 729.

———1803. *Systema Rhyngotorum.* Brunswick. x + 21 + 314 pp.

Fieber, F. X. 1859. Die Familie der Berytideae. *Wien. ent. Monatschr.*, vol. 3, pp. 200–209.

Kirkaldy, G. W. 1900. Bibliographical and nomenclatorial notes on the Rhynchota. No. 1. *Entomologist*, vol. 33, pp. 238–243.

Latreille, P. A. 1802. *Histoire naturelle, générale et particulière des crustacés et des insectes*, Vol. 3. Paris, xii + 467 pp.

———1810. *Considérations générales sur l'ordre naturel des animaux composant les classes des crustacés, des arachnides et des insectes; avec un tableau méthodique de leurs genres, disposés en familles.* Paris, 444 pp.

Mulsant, E. & Rey, C. 1870. *Histoire naturelle des punaises de France. Coréides, Alydides, Bérytides, Stenocéphalides.* Paris, 250 pp.

Reuter, O. M. 1888. Revisio synonymica Heteropterorum Palaearcticorum quae descripserunt auctores vetustiores (Linnaeus 1758–Latreille 1806) II. *Acta Soc. Sci. fenn.*, vol. 15, pp. 443–812.

Southwood, T. R. E. & Leston, D. 1959. *Land and water bugs of the British Isles.* London. ix + 436 pp.

Stichel, W. 1957. *Illustrierte Bestimmungstabellen der Wanzen. II. Europa. (Hemiptera-Heteroptera Europae).* Vol. 4. Heft 2. *Pentatomomorpha Lygaeoidea Piesmidae, Berytidae, Lygaeidae* (1). Berlin-Hermsdorf, pp. 33–64.

THYLACITES GERMAR, 1817; *BRACHYDERES* SCHÖNHERR, 1823; *CYCLODERES* SAHLBERG, 1823; AND *CYCLODERES* SCHÖNHERR, 1823 (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA): PROPOSAL TO MAINTAIN CURRENT USAGE. Z.N.(S.)2490

By A. T. Howden (*Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada*)

Brachyderes and *Cycloderes* are two distinct genera of weevils placed in two different tribes. The name *Thylacites* is currently applied to both genera. If *Thylacites* is suppressed, the most prevalent usage of the names will be stabilised and the family-group name BRACHYDERINAE will agree with its nominate type genus, *Brachyderes*.

2. *Thylacites* was established by Germar (1817, p. 341) but no type species was designated from the six valid species names that were included: *Curculio incanus* [Linnaeus, 1758, p. 385], *C. fritillum* [Panzer, 1794, p. 19], *C. faber* [Herbst, 1785, p. 81], *C. muricatus* [Fabricius, 1792, p. 489], *C. hirsutulus* [Fabricius, 1792, p. 468], and *C. coryli* [Fabricius, 1775, p. 148]. In 1819 (p. 205) Samouelle designated *'Cur. incanus'* as the type species of *Thylacites*. This type-species designation had been completely overlooked for 94 years when Pierce (1913, p. 411) commented on it. The only authors to adopt this correct application of *Thylacites* in the 70 years subsequent to Pierce have been Leng (1920, p. 313), Arnett (1960, p. 998, '. . . compiled from the Leng catalog . . .'), Kissinger (1964, p. 28), and O'Brien & Wibmer (1982, p. 44); *no* European authors have done so.

3. Chenu (1860, p. 220) subsequently designated *Curculio fritillum* Panzer (the second species in the list included by Germar) as the type species of *Thylacites* Germar. This is the next earliest available type-species designation after Samouelle's designation of *incanus* and represents the usual application of the name *Thylacites*. *Curculio incanus* L. is usually placed in BRACHYDERINI; *Curculio fritillum* Panzer is usually placed in TANYMECINI.

4. Recent works using *Thylacites* in the sense of Chenu are: Desbrochers des Loges (1903: revision), Winkler (1932, p. 1493), Portevin (1935, p. 68), van Emden (1944, p. 570), and Blackwelder (1947, p. 799).

5. *Brachyderes* was established by Schönherr in 1823 (col. 1140) with *'Curc. incanus* Auctor.' designated as the type species. Because Samouelle had already designated *incanus* L. as the type species of *Thylacites* (paragraph 2 above), *Brachyderes* is a junior objective synonym of *Thylacites*. However, *Brachyderes* continued to be used as a valid name and *Curculio incanus* L. was specifically cited as its type species by Schönherr (1826, pp. 10, 103), Westwood (1838, p. 35), Thomson (1859, p. 133), Lacordaire (1863, p. 61), and Chenu (1860, p. 220).

6. The *Coleopterorum Catalogus* (van Emden & van Emden, 1937, pp. 134–142) lists 17 species of *Brachyderes*, of which one, *incanus*, is

widespread throughout Europe and Scandinavia and is now established in North America (A. G. Wheeler, *in litt.*). Dieckmann (1970, p. 111) has pointed out that an application should be made to the International Commission to conserve the name *Brachyderes* Schönherr. As mentioned in paragraph 2 above, the use of *Brachyderes* over its senior synonym *Thylacites* has been almost unanimous. Notable references in the last 50 years include: van Emden (1944, p. 528), Hoffmann (1950, p. 323; 1963: revision), Endrödi (1960, p. 64), de Viedma (1967, p. 589), Dieckmann (1970, p. 111), van Boven (1972, p. 156), Baitenov (1974, p. 69), Silfverberg (1979, p. 64), and Smreczyński (1981, p. 262).

7. The name *Cycloderes* was published by both Sahlberg and Schönherr in 1823, each author citing a different type species. *Cycloderes* Sahlberg could be considered the earlier name if 13 June is accepted as the date of its publication (see (a) below). *Cycloderes* Schönherr apparently was published in October (see (b) below).

(a) The *Cycloderes* of Sahlberg (1823, p. 21) has *'Cycloderes catarrhactus* Schönherr' as type species by monotypy. The species is well described and illustrated by Sahlberg, and the spelling is emended in the same work to *'catarractus'* (loc. cit., p. 83). A note written by Sherborn inside the British Museum copy of Sahlberg 1823 states: 'This consists of 5 dissertations all *read* [italics mine] in June 1823; for particulars see Hagen ....' Both Hagen (1863, p. 102) and Horn and Schenkling (1928, p. 1035) associate pages 17 to 23 with W. Forssman on 13 June 1823, but it is not clear if these pages were read, submitted, or published on that date.

(b) The *Cycloderes* of Schönherr (1823, col. 1139) was established by listing '61. *Cycloderes* nob. Typ.: *Curc. robiniae* Herbst.' The date of publication presumably postdates Schönherr's introduction which is dated 12 July 1823. Silfverberg (*in litt.*) reasons that part 10 of a journal with monthly issues would have been published in October. Thus, it could be reasoned that *Cycloderes* Sahlberg was published four months earlier than Schönherr's *Cycloderes* and has priority. To fix the genus, the Commission is requested to place *Cycloderes* Sahlberg on the Official List of Generic Names.

8. *Cycloderes* Sahlberg and *Cycloderes* Schönherr are universally considered to be subjective synonyms of each other and of *Thylacites, sensu* Chenu. Hoffmann (1950, p. 417) erroneously considered *Thylacites* Germar, 1817 to be a nomen nudum and used *Cycloderes* Sahlberg as the next available name. This reasoning persisted in Hoffmann's subsequent papers, in Balachowsky (1963, p. 944), and probably influenced other authors as well. Likewise, the influential *Coleopterorum Catalogus* nowhere cites Germar, 1817 or Schönherr, 1823.

9. *Cycloderes* (Sahlberg or Schönherr) is the valid name of this genus of over 100 species and is apparently used more frequently than

Thylacites, sensu Chenu. Recent references using *Cycloderes* Sahlberg include: Günther & Zumpt (1933, pp. 23–38), Antoine (1949, pp. 73–132), Hoffmann (1950, see above), Solari (1953, pp. 64–98), Endrödi (1960, p. 82), Baitenov (1974, p. 96), and Kippenberg (1981, p. 274).

10. The family-group name 'Brachyderides' was first used by Schönherr (1826, p. 10) but is not valid since *Brachyderes* was a junior synonym at that time (Code, Article 11e). The family-group name THYLACITIDAE was first used by Kirby (1837, p. 207) who included in it only the otiorhynch genus *Trachyphloeus*. BRACHYDERINAE is much more frequently used than THYLACITINAE. The family-group name BRACHYDERINAE, having won 'general acceptance' in the sense of Article 40 of the Code, should therefore also be conserved in conjunction with the conservation of *Brachyderes*.

11. The type-species designations of the genera may be summarised thus:

	Thylacites	*Brachyderes*	*Cycloderes*
Samouelle, 1819	*incanus*	—	—
Schönherr, 1823	—	*incanus*	*robiniae*
Sahlberg, 1823	—	—	*catarractus*
Chenu, 1860	*fritillum*	—	—

12. In summary, the consequences of the International Commission suppressing *Thylacites* Germar and THYLACITINAE are, (1) to conserve the almost universal usage of *Brachyderes*, (2) to conserve the generally accepted family-group name which would agree with the nominal type genus, and (3) to maintain the valid and somewhat more frequently used *Cycloderes* over the subjectively synonymous *Thylacites, sensu* Chenu. It would be desirable to have a ruling on the matter before the publication of the Catalog of Coleoptera of North America now in preparation since it will include *Brachyderes incanus*.

13. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Thylacites* Germar, 1817, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority;

(2) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:

  (a) *Brachyderes* Schönherr, 1823 (gender: masculine), type species, by original designation, *Curculio incanus* Linnaeus, 1758;

  (b) *Cycloderes* Sahlberg, 1823 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Cycloderes catarractus* Sahlberg, 1823;

(3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

(a) *incanus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Curculio incanus* (specific name of type species of *Brachyderes* Schönherr, 1823);
(b) *catarractus* Sahlberg, 1823, as published in the binomen *Cycloderes catarractus* Sahlberg (specific name of type species of *Cycloderes* Sahlberg, 1823).

(4) to place the family-group name BRACHYDERINAE Schönherr, 1826 (type genus *Brachyderes* Schönherr, 1823) on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology;

(5) to place the family-group name THYLACITINAE Kirby, 1837 (type genus *Thylacites* Germar, 1817) (invalid because the name of its type genus has been suppressed under the plenary powers) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The problem presented here was discussed with many coleopterists around the world. The opinions expressed by them do not present a consensus, and it was my own decision to proceed with this petition as the most effective resolution. In addition to the many helpful discussions, special assistance was received from M. Alonso Zarazaga, Málaga, Spain; H. Silfverberg, Helsinki, Finland; R. T. Thompson, London, England; D. R. Whitehead, Washington, D.C.; and G. Wibmer, Tallahassee, Florida. The contributions of everyone are gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

ANTOINE, M. 1949. Notes d'entomologie marocaine. XLIX. Les *Cyclodères* du Maroc. *Mém. Mus. nat. Hist. Nat.* (N.S.), vol. 28, pp. 73–132.

ARNETT, R. H., Jr. 1960. *The beetles of the United States*. Washington, D.C. 1112 pp.

BAITENOV, M. S. 1974 [*Coleoptera: Attelabidae, Curculionidae from Central Asia and Kazakhstan. Illustrated checklist of genera and a species catalogue.*] Nauka, Alma-Ata. 285 pp. [in Russian]

BALACHOWSKY, A. S. (Ed.) 1963. *Entomologie appliquée à l'Agriculture*. 1. vol. 2. Paris. 1391 pp.

BLACKWELDER, R. E. 1947. Checklist of the coleopterous insects of Mexico, Central America, the West Indies, and South America. *Bull. U.S. natn. Mus.* vol., 185, pp. 765–925.

CHENU, J. C. 1860. *Encyclopédie d'Histoire naturelle . . . Coléoptères*. part 3. Paris. pp. 1–360.

DESBROCHERS DES LOGES, J. 1903. Monographie des Curculionides d'Europe et des confins de la Méditerranée en Afrique et en Asie, appartenant au genre *Thylacites*. *Le Frelon*, vol. 11, pp. 117–190; vol. 12, pp. 1–52.

DE VIEDMA, M. G. 1967. Revision del género *Brachyderes* Schönherr, ... *Eos, Madrid*, vol. 42, pp. 575–596.

DIECKMANN, L. 1970. Zur Nomenklatur einiger europäischer Rüsselkäfer-Gattungen. *Beitr. Entomol.*, vol. 20, pp. 111–128.

ENDRÖDI, S. 1960. Brachyderinae. Curculionidae. *Fauna Hungariae*, vol. 8, pp. 1–82.

FABRICIUS, J. C. 1775. *Systema entomologiae*. Lipsiae. 832 pp.

———1792. *Entomologia systematica*. vol. 1, part 2. Hafniae. 538 pp.

GERMAR, E. F. 1817. *Magazin Entomol.* (Germar), vol. 2, pp. 339–341.

GÜNTHER, K. & ZUMPT, F. 1933. Curculionidae; Tanymecinae. *Coleopterorum Catalogus*, pars 131, vol. 27, pp. 1–131.

HAGEN, H. A. 1863. *Bibliotheca entomologica*. vol. 2, N–Z. Leipzig. 512 pp.

HERBST, J. F. W. 1785. *Natursystem aller bekannten in-und ausländischen Insecten ... Kafer*. vol. 1, 310 pp.

HOFFMANN, A. 1950. Curculionides. *Faune de France*. vol. 52, 486 pp.

———1963. Révision des *Brachydères* paléarctiques. ... *Rev. Fr. Entomol.*, vol. 30, pp. 276–287.

HORN, W. & SCHENKLING, S. 1928. *Index litteraturae entomologicae*. vol. 3, pp. 705–1056.

KIPPENBERG, H. 1981. 9. Unterfamilie: Tanymecinae. In: FREUDE, H., HARDE, K. and LOHSE, G. A. *Die Käfer Mitteleuropas*, vol. 10. Krefeld. 310 pp.

KIRBY, W. 1837. The insects. *Fauna Boreali-Americana .... IV*. Norwich. 326 pp.

KISSINGER, D. G. 1964. *Curculionidae of America North of Mexico*. South Lancaster. 143 pp.

LACORDAIRE, T. 1863. *Histoire naturelle des insectes ....* vol. 6. Paris. 637 pp.

LENG, C. W. 1920. *Catalogue of the Coleoptera of America, North of Mexico*. Mount Vernon, New York. 470 pp.

LINNAEUS, C. 1758. *Systema naturae* 1. Editio decima reformata. Holmiae. 823 pp.

O'BRIEN, C. W. & WIBMER, G. J. 1982. *Annotated checklist of the weevils*. Ann Arbor. 382 pp.

PANZER, G. W. F. 1794. *Faunae insectorum germanicae initia ...*, 18. Nürnberg.

PIERCE, W. D. 1913. Miscellaneous contributions .... *Proc. U.S. natn. Mus.*, vol. 45, no. 1988. pp. 365–426.

PORTEVIN, G. 1935. Polyphaga: Rhynchophora. *Histoire naturelle des Coléoptères de France*. vol. 4. Paris. 500 pp.

SAHLBERG, C. R. 1823. *Periculi entomographici ...*, part 2, Aboae, pp. 17–32.

SAMOUELLE, G. 1819. *The entomologist's useful compendium ....* London. 451 pp.

SCHÖNHERR, C. J. 1823. Curculionides. *Isis*, Jena, vol. 7, cols. 1132–1146.

———1826. *Curculionidum dispositio methodica ....* Lipsiae. 338 pp.

SILFVERBERG, H. 1979. *Enumeratio Coleopterorum Fennoscandiae et Daniae*. Helsinki. 79 pp.

SMRECZYŃSKI, S. 1981. 8. Unterfamilie: Brachyderinae. In: FREUDE, H., HARDE, K. W. and LOHSE, G. A. *Die Käfer Mitteleuropas*. vol. 10. Krefeld. 310 pp.

SOLARI, F. 1953. Sulla monografia dei *Cycloderes (Thylacites)* di Desbrochers .... *Mem. Soc. entomol. ital.*, vol. 32, pp. 64–98.

THOMSON, C. G. 1859. *Skandinaviens Coleoptera*. vol. 1. Lund. 290 pp.

VAN BOVEN, J. 1972. Oeco-entomologische instructie. *Natuurhistorisch Maanbl.* vol. 61, pp. 152–159.

VAN EMDEN, F. I. 1944. A key to the genera of Brachyderinae of the world. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.*, ser. 11, vol. 11, pp. 503–586.

van Emden, M. & van Emden, F. I. 1937. Curculionidae: Brachyderinae 2. *Coleopterorum Catalogus,* pars 153, vol. 27, pp. 133–196.

Westwood, J. O. 1838. Synopsis of the genera of British insects. In: *An introduction to the modern classification of insects* . . . . . London. 158 pp.

Winkler, A. 1932. *Catalogus Coleopterorum regionis palaearcticae.* vol. 2, F. Rhynchophora. Pars 12. Wien, pp. 1393–1520.

STENODERMA TOLTECA SAUSSURE, 1860 (MAMMALIA, CHIROPTERA): PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF THE NEOTYPE AND VALIDATION OF THE REDISCOVERED HOLOTYPE.

Z.N.(S.)2466

By L. de Roguin and C. Weber (*Department of Mammalogy and Ornithology, Museum of Geneva, Switzerland*)

The purpose of this application is to request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to suppress the neotype of *Artibeus toltecus toltecus* (Saussure, 1860) designated by Davis, 1969, because of the existence of original type material deposited in the Museum of Geneva (MHNG).

2. Saussure, 1860, p. 427, described and figured a new species of Mexican Chiroptera. He named it *Stenoderma tolteca* but did not designate a type specimen.

3. Davis, 1969, p. 26, noted that no type was designated by Saussure, 1860, and none of the original material appeared to be extant. He designated as neotype a specimen from Mirador, Veracruz province, Mexico, (type locality as restricted by Hershkovitz, 1949) in the collection of the U.S. National Museum, USNM No. 38954/6981.

4. While preparing a new version of the list of type specimens of birds and mammals deposited in the Museum of Geneva, we had our attention drawn by the designation of a neotype of *Artibeus toltecus toltecus* (Saussure, 1860) in a review by Davis, 1969. This review was overlooked by the author of the first issue of the list of types (Baud, 1977), who mentioned that the holotype of *tolteca* was deposited in the Museum.

5. Saussure's holotype consists of skin and skull, MHNG No. 516. 13, adult, sex undetermined. The skin is slightly faded, left wing is broken, the right wing is worn in four places. There is also a 3 cm long stitching on the back. Measurements, in mm, are: forearm, 41.0; thumb, without nail, 4.0; ear, external face, 11.0; nose leaf, 9.3; breadth of interfemoral membrane at the anus, 4.4. All these measurements agree with those of the original description, in spite of a slight shrinking of the skin. The posterior part of the skull is missing, as are the zygomata. The lower mandible is intact. The holotype does not bear any original label, but it was registered in the entry book in August 1860 as *Stenoderma tolteca* Saussure.

6. The existence in the Museum of Geneva of type material from Mexico described by H. de Saussure was known by some American chiropterologists. For example, Miller & Allen, 1928, in writing about another species, *Myotis californicus mexicanus* (Saussure) noted: '*Type specimen.* — The description was based on an alcoholic specimen collected by H. de Saussure. If still in existence it is probably in the Museum of Natural History at Geneva, Switzerland, where most of Saussure's Mexican material is preserved.'

7. In a review of the genus *Leptonycteris*, Hoffmeister, 1957, writing about *nivalis nivalis* (Saussure) noted: '*Type.* — Sex not known to me, No. 515/97. Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle de Genève, Switzerland, originally skin and skull; now skull only . . . ' It seems clear from the literature that the whereabouts of much of Saussures's type material was well known.

8. Thus, in compliance with Article 75h of the Code, we refer this rediscovery of the holotype of *Stenoderma tolteca* to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and request that it:

(1) suppress the neotype designation of USNM No. 38954/6981 for *Artibeus toltecus toltecus* (Saussure, 1860) made by Davis, 1969;

(2) place the specific name *tolteca* Saussure, 1860, as published in the binomen *Stenoderma tolteca*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology, as defined by the holotype, MHNG No. 516.13.

REFERENCES

BAUD, F. 1977. Catalogue des types de mammifères et d'oiseaux du Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle de Genève. *Rev. suisse zool.*, vol. 84(1), pp. 201–220.

DAVIS, W. B. 1969. A review of the small fruit bats (genus *Artibeus*) of Middle America. *Southwest. Nat.*, vol. 14(1), pp. 15–29.

HERSHKOVITZ, P. 1949. Mammals of northern Colombia. Preliminary report No. 5: Bats (Chiroptera). *Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.*, vol. 99(3246), pp. 429–454.

HOFFMEISTER, D. F. 1957. Review of the long-nosed bats of the genus *Leptonycteris*. *J. Mamm.*, vol. 38(4), pp. 454–461.

MILLER, G. S. & ALLEN, G. M. 1928. The American bats of the genera *Myotis* and *Pizonyx*. *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.*, vol. 144, pp. 1–218.

SAUSSURE, H. DE. 1860. Note sur quelques mammifères du Mexique. *Rev. Mag. zool.*, ser. 2, vol. 12, pp. 428–431.

NEODORIPPE SERENE & ROMIMOHTARTO, 1969 (CRUSTACEA, DECAPODA): PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE SPECIES.

Z.N.(S.)2467

By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) and Raymond B. Manning (*National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

This is a simple case of a genus with a misidentified type species, and is referred to the Commission for a decision as prescribed by Article 70b of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature.

2. In the course of a revision of the Indo-West Pacific species formerly assigned to the brachyuran genus *Dorippe* Weber, 1795 (*Nomencl. entomol. Fabricii*, p. 93), Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969 (*Mar. Res. Indonesia*, no. 9) established several new genera and subgenera. One of these new genera is *Neodorippe* Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969 (*op. cit*, pp. 3, 5, 11), with the type species, by original designation and monotypy, *Dorippe astuta* Fabricius, 1798 (*Suppl. Entomol. Syst.*, p. 361).

3. A recent re-examination of the type material of Fabricius' species of *Dorippe* in the Zoological Museum of the University of Copenhagen and in the Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie at Leiden showed that the syntypes of *Dorippe astuta* Fabricius, 1798, do not belong to the species that Serène & Romimohtarto indicated as *Neodorippe astuta*, but in fact are the species named *Dorippoides facchino* (Herbst, 1785) (*Versuch einer Naturgeschichte der Krabben und Krebse*, vol. 1 (6), p. 190) by those authors. *Cancer facchino* Herbst, 1785, is the type species, by original designation and monotypy, of the subgenus *Dorippe (Dorippoides)* Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969, pp. 3, 4, 8. If *Dorippe astuta* is accepted as type species of the genus *Neodorippe*, that genus and *Dorippoides* become subjective synonyms.

4. A further examination of Fabricius' types showed that *Dorippe callida* Fabricius, 1798 (*Suppl. Entomol. Syst.*, p. 362), belongs to the species that Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969 incorrectly identified as *Neodorippe astuta*. Serène & Romimohtarto, not having seen Fabricius' types, evidently considered *Dorippe callida* a species incerta (as had been done by most previous authors) and ignored it in their revision.

5. The genus *Neodorippe* Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969, therefore, is clearly based on a misidentified type species, and the Commission should now decide which species should be selected as the legal type species of that genus. Two courses are open to the Commission: (1) to accept *Dorippe astuta* Fabricius, 1798, as the type species of *Neodorippe*; or (2) to use their plenary powers and assign *Dorippe callida* Fabricius, 1798, as the type of that genus.

6. Under solution (1) the name *Neodorippe* Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969 would either fall as a synonym of *Dorippoides* Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969, or replace that name, depending on the action of

the first revisor in this case. A new name would then have to be introduced for the genus containing *Dorippe callida* Fabricius, 1798.

7. Under solution (2) the name *Neodorippe* can continue to be used in the sense intended by its original authors, and no further action need be taken.

8. In our opinion the second course is definitely to be preferred as it will cause the least disturbance.

9. The family name DORIPPIDAE has already been placed on the Official List of Family Names in Zoology as Name no. 355, in Opinion 688 of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. No action concerning that name therefore seems to be called for, were it not that the name on the Official List is incorrectly attributed to De Haan, 1841, while as far as we can make out, the first use of it (as DORIPPINA) was by Macleay, 1838, p. 69. We therefore take this opportunity to request the Commission to correct this error.

10. The following are the concrete proposals that we now submit to the Commission, in which we ask that it:

(1) use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Neodorippe* Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969 and, having done so, to designate *Dorippe callida* Fabricius, 1798, as the type species of that genus;

(2) place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
  (a) *Dorippoides* Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969 (gender: masculine), type species, by original designation and monotypy, *Cancer facchino* Herbst, 1785;
  (b) *Neodorippe* Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Dorippe callida* Fabricius, 1798;

(3) place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
  (a) *callida* Fabricius, 1798, as published in the binomen *Dorippe callida* (specific name of the type species of *Neodorippe* Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969);
  (b) *facchino* Herbst, 1785, as published in the binomen *Cancer facchino* (specific name of the type species *Dorippoides* Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969);

(4) correct the entry under no. 355 on the Official List of Family Names in Zoology to DORIPPIDAE (correction by White, 1847, List Specimens Crustacea British Museum: 53, of DORIPPINA) MacLeay, 1838 (*in* A. Smith, *Illustrations of the Zoology of South Africa (Invertebrata)*, pp. 1–75, type genus: *Dorippe* Weber, 1795).

SAGARTIA LUCIAE VERRILL, 1898 (COELENTERATA, ACTINIARIA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE USE OF THE RELATIVE PRECEDENCE PROCEDURE. Z.N.(S.)2363

By Robert W. Seaton (*Department of Biological Science, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306, U.S.A.*)

The validity of the long and widely used specific name *luciae* Verrill, 1898, as published in the binomen *Sagartia luciae*, is threatened by at least two and possibly three prior specific names: *pustulata* McMurrich, 1887, as published in the binomen *Sagartia pustulata; lineata* Verrill, 1869, as published in the binomen *Sagartia lineata*; and *cavernata* Bosc, 1802, as published in the binomen *Actinia cavernata*. From 1898 to 1978 the specific name *luciae* Verrill, 1898, has never been employed as a junior synonym of these or any other prior names. Nomenclatural stability will be served best by giving nomenclatural precedence to the specific name *luciae* Verrill, 1898, whenever prior specific names are regarded as denoting the same biological taxon.

2. The intertidal sea anemone currently known as *Diadumene* (or *Haliplanella*) *luciae* is among the most widely distributed and studied of all coelenterates. It might now be the most widely distributed of all intertidal marine invertebrates (Dr L. L. Minasian, personal communication), and at sites where it is present it usually occurs in abundance (e.g. Verrill, 1898; Hargitt, 1912). Under the specific name *luciae* it is cited in the primary zoological literature at least 125 times by 76 authors in 56 of the last 82 years, including 29 of the last 32 years, and every year from 1963 to 1980. From 1950 to the present it is documented by the name *luciae* in at least 31 publications that are primarily ecological or distributional, in 13 that are primarily taxonomic, and in 34 that are primarily physiological or morphological in emphasis. (Ten of these works use *luciae* as a valid name: Carlgren, 1952; Stephenson & Stephenson, 1952; Hedgpeth, 1954; Pax & Muller, 1962; Calder, 1972; Belem & Monteiro, 1977; Dunn & Hand, 1977; Honma & Kitami, 1978; Williams, 1979; Minasian, 1980.) In contrast, the specific name *pustulata* McMurrich, 1887, appears in two later taxonomic discussions (McMurrich, 1921, p. 737, footnote; Hand, 1956, p. 217), in a key (Parker, 1900, p. 754), and with a question mark in a list (Carlgren, 1949, p. 102). It is never used as a senior synonym of *luciae*. The specific name *lineata* Verrill, 1869, is cited in five subsequent publications. McMurrich (1921, p. 737), Uchida (1932, p. 73) and Hand (1956, p. 217) remarked that *lineata* might be a senior synonym of *luciae*, but only recently has *lineata* been formally proposed or employed as a valid name for the species under consideration (Williams, 1978, p. 17; 1980, p. 84). The specific name *cavernata* Bosc, 1802, is often cited in the literature, but never as a synonym of *luciae*.

3. McMurrich, 1921, was unable to decide whether or not the unstriped animals that he had described in 1887 as *Sagartia pustulata* were

conspecific with *Sagartia luciae* Verrill, 1898. No type material of *pustulata* exists (McMurrich, 1921, p. 733). External features aside, *Diadumene luciae* differs from its congeners primarily by the microstructural characteristics of everted nematocysts from acontia (Hand, 1956) and from catch tentacles (Seaton, unpublished). These characters, as well as the peculiarities of external morphology, texture and coloration attributed to *pustulata* (McMurrich, 1887, p. 60), exist in certain clones of unstriped *Diadumene luciae* from the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico coasts of Florida (Seaton, unpublished). As Hand anticipated (1956, p. 217), re-examination of McMurrich's *pustulata* morphotype points to that specific name as a prior synonym of *Sagartia luciae* Verrill, 1898.

4. I concur with Williams, 1978, that the original description of *Sagartia lineata* (Verrill, 1869, p. 57) is diagnostic of the species described as *Sagartia luciae* Verrill, 1898. This is perhaps the only actiniarian species that in many cases can be identified with reasonable certainty by a color pattern alone: orange intermesenterial stripes (cf. Hand, 1956, p. 218). As Williams noted, Verrill, 1869, in fact described two of the four color 'races' recorded by Uchida, 1936, p. 895 (numbers one and four); but the stripes in Uchida's animals were orange or yellowish white, not red or pink as in Verrill's animals (1869, p. 57). It seems a minor distinction, yet one wonders why previous authors hesitated to assign validity to *lineata*. To my knowledge such red stripes, assuming that they are entirely red and not merely red distally, are uncommon, and also unknown in the literature after 1869 except for a color painting in Gosner, (1979, plate 12). I have seen such red-striped animals once, in a clone from Cameron, Louisiana.

5. Uchida, 1932, p. 71, remarked that along with *lineata* three other of Verrill's 1869 species might be identified with *luciae*: *Sagartia radiata, Sagartia sp.*, and *Sagartia* (?) *Napensis* [sic]. Uchida concluded that none of these, including *lineata*, could be accurately determined from Verrill's descriptions. With the exception of *lineata*, Uchida's judgement in this regard seems unquestionable.

6. The oldest reasonably certain record of the species under consideration might be the '*Actinia cavernosa* Bosc' of McCrady (1858, p. 275, 3 figs.), an incorrect subsequent spelling of the specific name *cavernata* Bosc, 1802. The specific name *cavernosa* is thus unavailable. Nothing in McCrady's paper demonstrates 'intent' to change the spelling in the sense of Article 33b (i) of the third edition of the Code. The identity of *Actinia cavernata* Bosc, 1802, is uncertain. Although Bosc's description and illustration (second edition, 1830, p. 260, plate 13 fig. 2) indicate similarities to *Diadumene luciae* (e.g. size, column texture, color pattern, habitat and abundance), like Andres (1881b, pp. 125–127) I recognize in Bosc's *cavernata* a stronger resemblance to *Aiptasiogeton comatus* (=*Paractis comata* Andres, 1881a) than to any other species. (In his 1883 monograph, Rome edition, pp. 166, 167, 240, Andres changed his mind.) Bosc's *cavernata* and McCrady's *cavernosa* were both collected in the Carolinas and have previously been considered synonyms (Verrill, 1864, p. 17;

Andres, 1883, p. 240; McMurrich, 1887, p. 62). Combined, the original descriptions of *cavernata* and *cavernosa* could only apply to *Diadumene luciae* among known Western Atlantic actiniarians, but taxonomic arguments based on such reasoning do not compel assent.

7. A *prima facie* case (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 31 (2), pp. 87–88) exists for suppressing the specific name *pustulata* McMurrich, 1887, but not for *lineata* Verrill, 1869. The specific name *cavernata* Bosc, 1802, cannot be suppressed without endorsement of uncertain taxonomic judgements. In view of the well established usage of the specific name *luciae* and the confusion that would ensue were any prior name to be substituted for it, it seems appropriate and parsimonious to request conservation under the 'relative precedence' procedure.

8. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to rule that the specific name *luciae* Verrill, 1898, as published in the binomen *Sagartia luciae*, is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the specific names *pustulata* McMurrich, 1887, as published in the binomen *Sagartia pustulata*; *lineata* Verrill, 1869, as published in the binomen *Sagartia lineata*; and *cavernata* Bosc, 1802, as published in the binomen *Actinia cavernata*, whenever it and any one of them are treated as synonyms;

(2) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

- (a) *luciae* Verrill, 1898, as published in the binomen *Sagartia luciae*, with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence as ruled under the plenary powers in (1) above;
- (b) *pustulata* McMurrich, 1887, as published in the binomen *Sagartia pustulata*;
- (c) *lineata* Verrill, 1869, as published in the binomen *Sagartia lineata*;
- (d) *cavernata* Bosc, 1802, as published in the binomen *Actinia cavernata*;

each with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over the specific name *luciae* Verrill, 1898, as published in the binomen *Sagartia luciae* when it is considered a synonym thereof.

REFERENCES

ANDRES, A. 1881a. Prodromus neopolitanae actiniarum faunae, addito generalis actiniarum bibliographiae catalogo. *Mittheil. zool. Stat. Neapel*, vol. 2, pp. 305–371.

——1881b. Intorno alla scissiparita delle attinie. *Mittheil. zool. Stat. Neapel*, vol. 2, pp. 305–371.

——1883. *Le Attinie*, Reale Accademia dei Lincei (1882–1883), Rome. (x, +460 pp. Pagination in this Rome edition differs from other Rome (1883) and Leipzig (1884) editions.)

BELEM, M. J. C. & MONTEIRO, D. C. 1977. Contribucaoes ao conhecimento da fauna de cnidairios de Rio de Janeiro. II. *Haliplanella luciae* (Verrill, 1898), una nova occurencia no Brazil. *Univ. fed. Rio de Janeiro, Inst. Biol., Dept. Zool.* separate 26, pp. 1–19.

BOSC, L. A. G. 1802. *Histoire naturelle des vers, contenant leur description et leurs moeurs; avec figures dessinées d'après nature*, 3 vols., Paris, Déterville.

———1830. *Histoire naturelle des vers*... (second edition, 3 vols.) Librairie Encyclopédique de Roret, Paris.

CALDER, D. R. 1972. Cnidaria of the Chesapeake Bay. *Chesapeake Sci.* vol. 13 (Suppl), pp. 100–102.

CARLGREN, O. 1949. A survey of the Ptychodactiaria, Corallimorpharia, and Actiniaria. *K. svenska Vetensk. Handl.* (4) vol. 1 (1), pp. 1–121.

———1952. Actiniaria from North America. *Ark. Zool.* (2) vol. 3 (30), pp. 373–390.

DUNN, D. F. & HAND, C. 1977. *Haliplanella* Treadwell, 1943 (Polychaeta): Request for suppression under the plenary powers in favour of *Haliplanella* Hand, 1955 (Anthozoa). *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34, pp. 94–97.

GOSNER, K. L. 1979. *A field guide to the Atlantic seashore*, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston.

HAND, C. 1956. The sea anemones of central California. Part III. The acontiarian anemones. *Wasmann J. Biol.* vol. 13, (for 1955) pp. 189–251.

HARGITT, C. W. 1912. The Anthozoa of the Woods Hole region. *Bull. U.S. Bur. Fish.* vol. 32, pp. 223–254.

HEDGPETH, J. W. 1954. Anthozoa: The anemones. *Fish. Bull. U.S. Fish Wildl. Serv.* vol. 55, pp. 285–290.

HONMA, Y. & KITAMI, T. 1978. Fauna and flora in the waters adjacent to the Sado Marine Biological Station, Niigata University. *Ann. Rep. Sado mar. Biol. Stn., Niigata Univ.* no. 8, pp. 7–81.

McCRADY, J. 1858. Instance of incomplete longitudinal fission in *Actinia cavernosa* Bosc. *Proc. Elliott Soc. Sci. Art.* vol. 1, pp. 275–278.

McMURRICH, J. P. 1887. Notes on Actiniae obtained at Beaufort, N.C. *Stud. biol. Lab. Johns Hopkins Univ.* vol. 4, pp. 55–63.

———1921. Note on the systematic position and distribution of the actinian *Sagartia luciae*. *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* (1921), pp. 729–739.

MINASIAN, L. L. 1980. The distribution of proliferating cells in an anthozoan polyp, *Haliplanella luciae* (Actiniaria: Acontiaria), as indicated by 3H-thymidine incorporation. Pp. 415–420. *In* P. Tardent & R. Tardent, eds., *Developmental and Cellular Biology of Coelenterates*, Elsevier/North-Holland Biomedical Press, Amsterdam.

PARKER, G. H. 1900. Synopses of North American invertebrates. XIII. The Actiniaria. *Amat. Nat.* vol. 34, pp. 747–758.

PAX, F. & MULLER, I. 1962. Die Anthozoenfauna der Adria. *Fauna Flora Adriat.* vol. 3, pp. 1–343.

STEPHENSON, T. A. & STEPHENSON, A. 1952. Life between tide marks in North America. Part II. Northern Florida and the Carolinas. *J. Ecol.* vol. 40, pp. 1–49.

UCHIDA, T. 1932. Occurrence in Japan of *Diadumene luciae*, a remarkable actinian of rapid dispersal. *J. Fac. Sci. Hokkaido imp. Univ.* (6) vol. 2, pp. 69–82.

———1936. Influence of the currents upon the distribution of races and frequency of asexual reproduction in the actinian, *Diadumene luciae*. *Zool. Mag., Tokyo*, vol. 48, pp. 895–906.

VERRILL, A. E. 1864. Revision of the polypi of the eastern coast of the United States. *Mem. Boston Soc. nat. Hist.* vol. 1, pp. 1–45.

———1869. Synopsis of the polyps and corals of the North Pacific Exploring Expedition, under Commodore C. Ringgold and Capt. John Rogers, U.S.N., from 1835 to 1856. Collected by Dr Wm. Stimpson, naturalist to the expedition. Part IV. Actiniaria. *Essex Inst. (Salem, Mass.) Communs.* vol. 6, pp. 51–104.

———1898. Descriptions of new American Actinians, with critical notes on other species, I. *Am. J. Sci.* (4) vol. 6, pp. 493–498.

WILLIAMS, R. B. 1978. A comment on the request for suppression of *Haliplanella* Treadwell (Polychaeta) in favour of *Haliplanella* Hand (Anthozoa). *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 35, pp. 17–18.

———1979. A survey of the littoral anthozoa, with additional notes on some other marine invertebrates of Gower, South Wales. *Nature Wales* vol. 16, pp. 253–266.

———1980. A further note on catch tentacles in sea anemones. *Trans. Norfolk Norwich Nat. Soc.* vol. 25, pp. 84–86

Opinion 1346. *Cythereis distinguenda* Neviana, 1928, *Cythere crispata* Brady, 1868 and *Cythere pavonia* Brady, 1866 (Crustacea, Ostracoda) 274
Opinion 1347. *Anthalia schoenherri* Zetterstedt, 1838 (Insecta, Diptera) . 277
Opinion 1348. *Bos gaurus* H. Smith, 1827 (Mammalia, Artiodactyla) . . 279
Opinion 1349. *Antilope depressicornis* H. Smith, 1827 and *Anoa quarlesi* Ouwens, 1910 (Mammalia, Artiodactyla) 281
Opinion 1350. *Conus antiquus* Lamarck, 1810 (Mollusca, Gastropoda) . 283
Opinion 1351. *Galeopsomyia* Girault, 1916 (Insecta, Hymenoptera) . . 285
Opinion 1352. *Eurhinus* Schönherr, 1825 (Insecta, Coleoptera): a justified emendation of *Eurhin* Illiger, 1807 287
Opinion 1353. *Myzus festucae* Theobald, 1917 (Insecta, Hemiptera) 291

New and revived cases

Berytus Fabricius, 1803 (Insecta, Heteroptera, Berytidae). W. R. Dolling 293
Thylacites Germar, 1817; *Brachyderes* Schönherr, 1823; *Cycloderes* Sahlberg, 1823 and *Cycloderes* Schönherr, 1823 Insecta, Coleoptera). A. T. Howden 296
Stenoderma tolteca Saussure, 1860 (Mammalia, Chiroptera). L. de Roguin and C. Weber 302
Neodorippe Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969 (Crustacea, Decapoda) L. B. Holthuis and R. B. Manning 304
Sagartia luciae Verrill, 1898 (Coelenterata, Actiniaria). R. W. Seaton . 306

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature wishes to express its appreciation of the facilities provided by the Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History) for the Secretariat of the Commission.

CONTENTS

Page
Officers and Members of the Commission v
Members of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature . . vi
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology 205
Special Announcements 206

Comments

On proposed amendment to Article 51c of the Code. B. C. Ratcliffe; J. R. Vockeroth; R. W. Crosskey and others 209
Tibicina Amyot, 1847 and *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926. K. G. A. Hamilton; M. Boulard; P. Lauterer 211
Aphelinus mytilaspidis Le Baron, 1870 D. Rosen 214
Chromis Cuvier, 1814 (Osteichthyes). S. O. Kullander; A. R. Emery . . 215
HOLOTHUROIDEA. L. B. Holthuis 219
Glyphipterix Hübner, [1825]. J. D. Bradley & K. Sattler 219
CAECILIIDAE in Amphibia and Insecta. M. H. Wake 220

Opinions

Opinion 1328. *Belemnites mucronatus* Schlotheim, 1813 (Coleoidea) . . 222
Opinion 1329. *Galago crassicaudatus* E. Geoffroy, 1812 (Primates, Galigidae) 226
Opinion 1330. *Prodorylaimus* Andrassy, 1959 (Nematoda) 228
Opinion 1331. SPHAERIIDAE Jeffreys, 1862 (1820) (Mollusca, Bivalvia) and MICROSPORIDAE Reichardt, 1976 (Insecta, Coleoptera) . . . 230
Opinion 1332. *Calamoecia australica* Sars, 1908 and *Calamoecia australis* (Searle, 1911) (Crustacea, Copepoda) 233
Opinion 1333. *Ipnops murrayi* Günther, 1878 (Ostiechthyes) 236
Opinion 1334. *Harminius* Fairmaire, 1851 (Coleoptera) 238
Opinion 1335. *Nepa cinerea* Linnaeus, 1758 (Insecta, Heteroptera) . . 241
Opinion 1336. Five specific names proposed for *Heterodera* A. Schmidt, 1871 (Aschelminthes, Nematoda) by B. A. Cooper, 1955 244
Opinion 1337. *Selkirkia columbia* Conway Morris, 1977 as type species of *Selkirkia* Walcott, 1911 (Priapulida) 249
Opinion 1338. *Thrips rufus* Haliday, 1836 (Insecta, Thysanoptera) . . 251
Opinion 1339. *Papilio fatima* Fabricius, 1793 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) . . 255
Opinion 1340. *Attus otiosus* Hentz, 1846 (Arachnida, Araneae) . . . 258
Opinion 1341. *Simulium amazonicum* Goeldi (Insecta, Diptera) . . . 261
Opinion 1342. *Damalis planiceps* Fabricius, 1805 (Insecta, Diptera) . . 264
Opinion 1343. *Kinosternon alamosae* Berry & Legler, 1980 and *Kinosternon oaxacae*, Berry & Iverson, 1980 (Reptilia, Testudines . 266
Opinion 1344. *Mayorella* Schaeffer, 1926 given nomenclatural precedence over *Dactylamoeba* Korotneff, 1880 (Rhizopoda, Amoebida) 269
Opinion 1345. *Laomedea flexuosa* Alder, 1857, *Sertularia volubilis* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Campanularia johnstoni* Alder, 1856 (Coelenterata, Hydroida) 271

Continued on Inside Back Cover

Printed in Great Britain by Henry Ling Ltd., at the Dorset Press, Dorchester, Dorset

6 December, 1985 Volume 42 Part 4
pp. vii–viii, 311–420, T.P., I–VII
ISSN 0007–5167

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

The Official Organ of the International
Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

COMMONWEALTH AGRICULTURAL BUREAUX

The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

Published by: **Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux**

On behalf of: **International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature**
c/o British Museum (Natural History)
Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

Orders and enquiries concerning subscriptions and back numbers should be sent to:

CENTRAL SALES
COMMONWEALTH AGRICULTURAL BUREAUX
FARNHAM ROYAL
SLOUGH SL2 3BN, U.K.

© *International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature 1985.* All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronically, mechanically, by photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

President: Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia).*

Vice-President: Prof. Dr. Raphael ALVARADO *(Departamento de Zoologia, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Madrid, Madrid 28040, Spain).*

Executive Secretary: Dr. P.K. TUBBS *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD).*

Secretary-General: Dr. L.B. HOLTHUIS *(Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands).*

B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of election or of most recent re-election)

Prof. Dr. Raphael ALVARADO *(Departamento de Zoologia, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Madrid, Madrid 28040, Spain)* (30 September 1972) **Echinoidea; Asteroidea**

Dr. L.B. HOLTHUIS *(Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Histoire, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Crustacea**

Dr. G. BERNARDI *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) *(Councillor)* **Lepidoptera**

Prof. C DUPUIS *(Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 45 rue de Buffon, 75005, Paris, France)* (30 September 1972) **Heteroptera**

Dr. M. MROCZKOWSKI *(Instytut Zoologiczny, Polska Akademia Nauk. ul. Wilcza 64, Warsaw, Poland)* (14 March 1975) **Coleoptera**

Prof. Dr. Otto KRAUS *(Zoologisches Institut und Zoologisches Museum, 2000 Hamburg 13, Germany)* (29 September 1976) **Arachnida, Myriapoda**

Dr. W.D.L. RIDE *(School of Applied Science, Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, A.C.T. 2616, Australia)* (29 September 1976) *(President)*: **Mammalia: Recent and Fossil**

Dr. H.G. COGGER *(Australian Museum, Sydney 2000, N.S.W. Australia)* (29 September 1976) **Reptilia: E D P Methods**

Prof. Dr. Gerhard HAHN *(Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Universitätsgebiet Lahnberge, 3550 Marburg, BRD)* (27 December 1978) **Palaeontology**

Prof. Dr. O. HALVORSEN *(Institute of Biology and Geology, University of Tromsö, P.O. Box 790, N-9001 Tromsö, Norway)* (27 December 1978) **Parasitology**

Dr. V.A. TRJAPITZIN *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad B-164, USSR)* (27 December 1978) **Entomology**

Dr. F.M. BAYER *(U.S. National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) *(Councillor)* **Octocorallia; Systematics**

Prof. John O. CORLISS *(University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, U.S.A.)* (23 August 1979) **Protozoa; Systematics**

Mr. R.V. MELVILLE *(93 Lock Road, Ham, Richmond, Surrey, TW10 7LL, U.K.)* (23 August 1979) *(Secretary)* **Palaeontology**

Dr. Y.I. STAROBOGATOV *(Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad 199164, U.S.S.R.)* (23 August 1979) **Mollusca, Crustacea**

Dr. P.T. LEHTINEN *(Zoological Museum, Department of Biology, University of Turku. SF-20500 Turku 50, Finland)* (8 August 1980) **Arachnida**

Dr. L.R.M. COCKS *(British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD)* (26 August 1982) **Brachiopoda**

Mr. David HEPPELL *(Department of Natural History, Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh EH1 1JF, Scotland)* (26 August 1982) *(Councillor)* **Mollusca**

Prof. Jay M. SAVAGE *(Department of Biology, University of Miami, P.O. Box 249118, Coral Gables, Florida 33124, U.S.A.)* (26 August 1982) **Herpetology**

Prof. R. SCHUSTER *(Institut für Zoologie, Universität Graz, Universitätsplatz 2, A–8010 Graz, Austria)* (26 August 1982) **Acari**

Dr. SHUN-ICHI UENO *(Department of Zoology, National Science Museum, Hyakunincho 3-23-1, Shinjukuku, Tokyo 160, Japan)* (26 August 1982) **Entomology**

Prof. A. WILLINK *(Universidad Nacional de Tucumán, Instituto Miguel Lillo, Miguel Lillo 205, 4000 Tucumán, Argentina)* (26 August 1982) **Neotropical Hymenoptera**

Dr. G.C. GRUCHY *(National Museum of Natural Sciences, Ottawa, Canada, K1A 0M8)* (15 April 1985) **Ichthyology**

Dr. Z. KABATA *(Canada Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Pacific Biological Station, Nanaimo, B.C. V9R 5K6, Canada)* (4 September 1985) **Copepoda**

Dr. F.C. THOMPSON *(Systematic Entomology Laboratory, USDA c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.)* (4 September 1985) **Diptera**

Prof. B.S. ZHENG *(Department of Vertebrate Taxonomics and Faunistics, Institute of Zoology, 7 Zhongguancun Lu, Haitien, Beijung, China)* (4 September 1985) **Ichthyology**

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Members of the Trust

Professor H.B. Whittington, F.R.S. *(Chairman)*
Dr. F.G.W. Jones *(Secretary and Managing Director)*
Prof. Per Brinck
Prof. J.H. Callomon
Dr. P.F.S. Cornelius
Prof. C.B. Cox
The Rt. Hon. the Earl of Cranbrook, F.L.S., F.Z.S.
Mr. D. Curry
Sir Arthur Drew, K.C.B.
Sir Charles Fleming, K.B.E., F.R.S.
Prof. J. Forest
Col. Francis J. Griffin, O.B.E.
Dr. G.C. Gruchy
Dr. R.H. Hedley, F.I.Biol.
Dr. L.B. Holthuis
Dr. M.K. Howarth
Sir Peter Kent, F.R.S.
Prof. Dr. O. Kraus
Dr. M. Luc
Dr. R.B. Manning
Mr. R.V. Melville
Dr. I.W.B. Nye
Dr. E.P.F. Rose, T.D.
Dr. W.D.L. Ride *(ex officio)*
Dr. G.B. White
Prof. J.M. Dodd, F.R.S. *(Observer for the Royal Society)*

B. The Officers of the Trust

Dr. P.K. Tubbs, M.A., Ph.D. *(Scientific Controller)*
Mr. M.E. Tollitt, M.Sc., F.L.S., F.R.E.S. *(Assistant Zoologist)*
Mr. J.D.D. Smith, F.G.S. *(Administrator)*

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 42, part 4 (pp. vii–viii, 311–420, T.P., I–VII) 6 December 1985

NOTICES

(a) *Invitation to comment.* The Commission is entitled to start to vote on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* six months after the publication of each application. This period is normally extended to enable comments to be submitted. Any zoologist who wishes to comment on any of the applications is invited to send his contribution, in duplicate, to the Secretary of the Commission as quickly as possible, and in any case in time to reach the Secretary within twelve months of the date of publication of the application.

(b) *Possible use of the plenary powers.* The possible use by the Commission of its plenary powers is involved in the following applications published in the present part of the *Bulletin* (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23b and 79b):

(1) *Semionotus* Agassiz, 1832 (Osteichthyes): proposed designation of *Semionotus bergeri* Agassiz, 1833 as type species. Z.N.(S.) 2434. Amy R. McCune.

*(2) *Cephalopholis argus* Schneider, 1801 and *Cephalopholis sexmaculata* (Rüppell, 1830) (Osteichthyes, Serranidae): proposed conservation by suppression of *Bodianus guttatus* Bloch, 1790, *Anthias argus*, Bloch, 1792 and *Serranus zanana* Valenciennes, 1828. Z.N.(S.) 2470. J. E. Randall, M. L. Bauchot, A. Ben-Tuvia, & P. C. Heemstra.

(3) *Cheirurus* Beyrich, 1845 (Trilobita): proposed designation of *Cheirurus insignis* Beyrich, 1845 as type species. Z.N.(S.) 2337. P. D. Lane.

(4) *Eugynothrips* Priesner, 1926 (Insecta, Thysanoptera): proposed designation of *Cryptothrips conocephali* Karny, 1913 as type species. Z.N.(S.) 2503. D. J. Brothers & L. A. Mound.

(5) HETEROGYNIDAE Rambur, 1866 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) and HETEROGYNINAE Nagy, 1969 (Insecta, Hymenoptera): proposals to remove the homonymy. Z.N.(S.) 2496. M.C. Day.

(6) THAIDIDAE Jousseaume, 1888 (Mollusca, Gastropoda) and THAIDIDAE Lehtinen, 1967 (Arachnida, Araneae): proposals to remove the homonymy. Z.N.(S.) 2307. P. T. Lehtinen.

(7) *Drasterius bimaculatus* (Rossi, 1790) (Insecta, Coleoptera, Elateridae): proposed conservation by suppression of *Elater bimaculatus* Fourcroy, 1785. Z.N.(S.) 2345. M. Mroczkowski.

*(8) *Microchrysa* Loew, 1855 (Insecta, Diptera): proposed conservation by suppression of *Chrysomyia* Macquart, 1834. Z.N.(S.) 2453. E. P. Nartshuk & R. Rozkošný.

*(9) *Musca trilineata* Linnaeus, 1767 (Insecta, Diptera): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Musca graeca* Pontoppidan, 1763. Z.N.(S.) 2454. E. P. Nartshuk & R. Roskošný.

(10) The family names for the storm petrels and the dippers. Z.N.(S.) 2024. R. V. Melville.

(c) *Receipt of new applications.* The following new applications have been received since going to press for vol. 42 (3) (published on 30 September 1985) (any marked with an asterisk involve the application of Articles 23b and 79c):

(1) *Nomadacris* Uvarov, 1923 (Insecta, Orthoptera): proposed conservation. Z.N.(S.) 2525. K. H. L. Key & N. D. Jago.

(2) *Balcis* Leach in Gray, 1847 (Mollusca, Gastropoda): proposed designation of *Strombiformis albus* Da Costa, 1778 as type species. Z.N.(S.) 2526. A. Warén.

*(3) *Heteronota pelagica* Girard, 1857 (Reptilia, Sauria): proposed designation. Z.N.(S.) 2527. G. R. Zug.

(4) *Listrocelis pectinata* Guérin-Méneville, 1830 (Insecta, Grylloptera): proposed acceptance of *Phisis* Stål, 1861 and *Teuthras* Stål, 1874 as type species. Z.N.(S.) 2528. D. K. Mc. E. Kevan.

*(5) *Polymastodon taoensis* Cope, August 1882 (Mammalia, Multituberculata): proposed conservation and designation as type species of *Taeniolabis* Cope, July 1882. Z.N.(S.) 2529. M. B. Simmons.

(d) *Guidelines for applications to the Commission.* Intending applicants should draw up their applications in line with the Guidelines published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature,* volume 42, part 1. pages 3–5. Copies of the Guidelines can be obtained from the Executive Secretary.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Professor E. E. Binder (Switzerland), who was first elected in 1962, and Professor Per Brinck (Sweden), first elected in 1958 and Vice-President since 1977, retired from the Commission on 6 September 1985. Their services were invaluable, and the Commission is most grateful to them.

During the XXII General Assembly of the International Union of Biological Sciences in Budapest the Section on Zoological Nomenclature met on 4 September, and made the following elections to the Commission:
Dr Zbigniew Kabata (Canada; Copepoda)
Dr F. Christian Thompson (U.S.A.; Diptera)

Dr Bao-shan Zheng (China; Ichthyology).
The Commission is glad to welcome these new members.

ELECTION OF VICE PRESIDENT

The members of the Commission have elected Professor Dr Raphael Alvarado (Universidad de Madrid) to be Vice-President from 1 November 1985.

P. K. TUBBS
Executive Secretary
November 1985

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

GENERAL MEETING, BUDAPEST, 2–6 SEPTEMBER 1985

Present: W. D. L. Ride (President) in the Chair: Alvarado, Bernardi, Brinck, Cogger, Corliss, Dupuis, Gruchy, Heppell, Lehtinen, Savage, Schuster, Starobogatov, Trjapitzin and the Secretary. Tubbs and Smith from the Secretariat also present.

(1) Apologies for absence had been received from Bayer, Cocks, Kraus and Willink.

(2) The minutes of the previous General Meeting (Ottawa, August 1982) had been published in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 40, pp. 7–13.

(3) The Agenda was adopted as circulated with the addition of an item for Any Other Business.

(4) The Secretary's report to IUBS had been circulated. There was no discussion.

5 *President's Report*

The President opened his report by paying tribute to Mr Richard V. Melville who would retire from the post of Secretary of the Commission at the end of the IUBS General Assembly. The President said that Mr Melville's association with the Commission had begun more than 30 years ago when he played a prominent part in the 1953 Copenhagen Colloquium and the International Congress of Zoology Section on Nomenclature, subsequently verifying and seeing through to publication the "Copenhagen Decisions". In 1958 Mr Melville was seconded from the Geological Survey and Museum for 18 months as Assistant Secretary of the Commission in order to be Secretary of the London Colloquium and Congress Section on Nomenclature. In 1968 he was elected a member of the Commission and appointed its Secretary. Outstanding amongst his many achievements as Secretary and Editor of the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature had been the preparation of some 500 Opinions, the handling of the Appeal for Funds to ensure the Commission's survival and his secretaryship of the Editorial Committee for the 3rd Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. The Commission RESOLVED to record in the Minutes the great debt that it and zoologists as a whole owed to Mr Melville.

Other points raised in the President's report and not recorded in other items of the Minutes were:

a) *Financial Position:* A note on the financial position of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature was circulated. The President pointed out that, to avoid bankruptcy and cessation of the Council's work, it was essential to increase the Trust's income. He emphasised the urgency of resolving the financial problem by widening the funding-base for the Commission's work and urged all Commissioners to do their utmost to encourage funding organizations in their own countries to provide long-term support. The President recorded that, in addition to a grant from IUBS, donations had been made by the Royal Society of London and the British research councils; the Australian Academy of Sciences; the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters; the Royal Society of New Zealand; the South African Council for Scientific and Industrial Research; the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences; and the Academia Sinica, Taiwan. He was particularly pleased to be able to announce that a most welcome donation had also been received from the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

> [The following resolution was adopted by the IUBS General Assembly:
>
> *RESOLUTION 4: SUPPORT FOR SYSTEMS OF NOMENCLATURE*
>
> *Recalling* the decisions and conclusions of previous General Assemblies on the fundamental and applied importance of taxonomy, including nomenclature and of the need for international support for systems of nomenclature that will secure their continued function,
>
> *Appreciating* the generous support provided in recent years to Zoological Nomenclature by members of IUBS and, in particular, by the Royal Society including the British research councils, the Australian Academy of Science, the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, the Royal Society of New Zealand, the South African Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, and the Academia Sinica, Taiwan,
>
> *Noting* with pleasure the donation made by the USSR Academy of Sciences announced at the General Assembly,
>
> *Commends* to all member bodies the importance of developing and providing ongoing support for all systems of biological nomenclature which provides a fundamental base for communication in biological science.]

b) *3rd Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature:* The 3rd Edition of the Code had been published in February 1985 and more than 3500 of the 5000 copies printed had already been sold. The Trust was negotiating translation rights for a number of languages, particularly German, Italian and Spanish. Such translations would facilitate dissemination of the Code and also bring in a useful income to the Trust through royalties. Dr Trjapitzin announced that a Russian translation was being prepared by the USSR Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. He explained that the Commission, now under the Presidency of Professor Andrijashev and with Dr I. M. Kerzhner as Secretary, was set up in 1946 to encourage zoological nomenclature in a number of ways relating both to research and education. The Russian translation of the Code would incorporate the Official Lists of Names in Zoology, and the Soviet Commissioners were asked to liaise with the Secretariat who were preparing an updated edition of the Official Lists. The President asked Commissioners in those countries where a translation of the Code was not yet in hand to take steps to procure a translation.

c) *Council Meeting:* A meeting of Council had been held on 11 October 1984. A copy of the Minutes could be seen on request.

6 *Election of Commissioners*

i) *Procedure for Elections.* Although casual vacancies can be filled by the Commission itself (Article 4(f) of the Constitution), it was agreed that, to widen the Commission's foundations, the formal election procedure through the Section of Nomenclature should be followed when the timing was feasible.

It was suggested that meetings of ICSEB would provide additional opportunities for the Section of Nomenclature to meet, with the advantage over the IUBS General Assembly that many more systematic zoologists would be present. This would provide an additional opportunity for the election of members of the Commission, although the elections would not take effect until the close of the following IUBS General Assembly. A revision of the Statutes of the Section of Zoological Nomenclature of IUBS was agreed (see Appendix).

It was thought desirable that the Commission should receive more nominations that at present, and it was agreed that unsuccessful nominees should remain on the list for one further meeting of the Section.

The Commission considered the recommendation of the Council that it should at the election of Commissioners depart from the procedure of only presenting pairs of candidates on the slate. It was agreed that to enable a new procedure to be adopted the Bylaws would be amended. While the Commission was enabled under the Constitution to submit to the Section a single list of unpaired vacancies providing the total nominations did not exceed twice the number of vacancies, there was sufficient ambiguity in the present wording to render amendment desirable.

The Commission RESOLVED to propose to amend Article 4(d) to read: "The Commission shall prepare a list of not more than twice as many nominees as there are places to be filled, under procedures to be specified in the Bylaws, and shall present it to the Section of Nomenclature". It was also decided to amend Bylaws 3 and 5 so that vacancies are not treated individually. The Secretariat was authorised to develop new wording prescribing the voting procedure for voting on a single list.

ii) *Election to Vacancies*. Following the retirements of Commissioners Binder, Brinck and Sabrosky, there were 3 vacancies to be filled and papers nominating 6 candidates had been circulated. The Commission RESOLVED to present the Section with a single list of all these nominees; that there should be successive ballots in each of which the candidate having the most votes would be elected and have his name removed from the next ballot; and that a tie in any ballot should be decided by the Chairman's casting vote.

The nominees were considered using the criteria in Article 2(c) of the Constitution, and 3 (Kabata, Thompson and Zheng) were selected for recommendation to the Section under Bylaw 3(a).

> [A meeting of the Section was held on 4 September, and Drs Z. Kabata (Canada; Copepoda), F. C. Thompson (USA; Diptera) and B. S. Zheng (China; Ichthyology) were elected. Amended Statutes of the Section, as proposed by the Commission, were adopted.]

7 *Appointment of Executive Secretary and Secretary-General and their duties*

Following discussion of a proposal to appoint an Executive Secretary and a Secretary-General, the following changes to Bylaws were agreed (with renumbering as necessary):

i) *New Bylaw* — The Council shall appoint an Executive Secretary and, in addition, it may appoint a Secretary-General. Both appointments shall end at the close of the next General Assembly, and may be renewed. The word Secretary in the Constitution and Bylaws shall, unless otherwise specified, mean the Executive Secretary. The duties of the Offices shall be as described in Bylaws as follows: [numbers to be inserted]

ii) *New sections of Bylaw 23: duties of the Secretariat* to read:

g) to send drafts of Opinions to the Secretary-General before publication, and to incorporate or discuss with him any comments or amendments he may make within one month.

h) to send every proposal for amendment of the Code, Constitution and Bylaws to the Secretary-General for his agreement before submitting them to the Council prior to publication.

iii) *Bylaw 24* to read:

24. Where, after the issue of a voting paper, the Executive Secretary

discovers or is informed that the application was incomplete or incorrect, he shall have discretion to defer publication of the Commission's decision, in which case he shall at once notify the Secretary-General. The Secretary-General shall have discretion to proceed with the publication; if he does not do so, the Executive Secretary shall within one month refer the matter to the Council. The Council may then declare the vote to be cancelled, or direct that a vote be taken under the One-Month Rule (Bylaw 33) or direct the Executive Secretary to publish the decision taken by the Commission's vote. In any reference to the Council under this Bylaw the Executive Secretary may act on the decision of the majority of the Council responding within one calendar month.

iv) *New Bylaw 27* to read:

27. The Secretary-General shall on request by the Executive Secretary give assistance on any matter of doubt or difficulty.

8 *Office of Vice-President*

Under Bylaw 10, it was RESOLVED that the procedure for electing a successor to Professor Per Brinck as Vice-President would begin on 1 October 1985. Under Bylaw 11(b), Dr H. G. Cogger and Mr R. V. Melville were appointed to join the Council for the purpose of nominating two candidates. It was RESOLVED that, by amendment to Bylaw 11(b), this nomination could proceed immediately.

9 *Proposed Amendments to the Code*

A number of proposals to amend the 3rd Edition of the Code had been received and some of these had been published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. The President pointed out that those which had been published could proceed to a vote. Nevertheless, he thought that the new edition of the Code should be given time to settle down and become fully used before significant amendments were decided. He had set up a Scrutinizing Committee to consider proposed amendments and make recommendations at the next IUBS General Assembly, at which time a decision could be taken on setting up an editorial committee for the 4th Edition of the Code. The Commission RESOLVED to refer all proposed amendments to the Scrutinizing Committee but, for the benefit of members present at the meeting, it was agreed to hold preliminary discussions of proposals that had been received to date.

The Commission (Mr Heppell in the Chair in the President's absence) proceeded to examine the proposed amendments.

Proposed Amendment to Article 51c : Bull. zool. Nomencl. 41(3) Aug. 1984: 149–150 and comments in *Bull.* 42(1) : 10–12

Members were generally agreed that the use of parentheses to enclose the name of the author of a specific-group name in a new combination was of some value in taxonomic works, but of less value for other uses. However, this point had to be weighed against the disadvantage of giving misleading information when, as frequently happened, parentheses were wrongly omitted in a secondary combination. To amend Article 51c as proposed would have the advantage of eliminating this source of misinformation. Apart from a change to Recommendation 22B, there would be no other implications for the Code.

Proposed Amendment to Article 59b : Bull. 41(3) : 151

This Article makes permanently invalid a junior secondary homonym that has been replaced before 1961. Members preferred not to see a change since they considered this to be a useful provision which was clearly worded and for which there was a let-out clause when stability was threatened.

Proposed Amendment to Article 70b : ibid : 156–158 and comments in *Bull.* 42(1) : 12, 13 & *Bull.* 42(2) : 123

Members agreed that there was a case for modification of the text and the Scrutinizing Committee should be asked to examine this in detail.

Request for a Declaration clarifying the meaning of "suppressed" and "rejected", and the status of works not complying with Articles 8 or 9 : Bull. 41(3) : 152–155

This application by Drs Holthuis, Ride and Sabrosky was discussed and referred to the Scrutinizing Committee.

10 *Proposed Suppression of Works (Code Article 79)*

Papers relating to a likely request for suppression of publications had been circulated before the meeting. The works in question were by R. W. Wells and C. R. Wellington (Australian Journal of Herpetology *1*, 73–79, (1984) and Aus. J. Herpetol. Supplement Series No. 1 (1985)).

Among the grounds for objection to these works by a large number of Australian herpetologists were:

i) No (or inadequate) justifications are given for proposed taxonomic and nomenclatural changes, which include omissions and errors.

ii) The publication were not apparently subjected to impartial peer and editorial review.

iii) If taken seriously they would permanently destabilize the nomenclature of the Australian herpetofauna.

In discussion other points were raised. Attention was drawn to the question of scale (107 new genera and 470 new species) and it was pointed out that there was nothing new in zoologists producing works which destabilized taxonomy, but new methodology meant that this could be done more quickly and on a wider scale. It was important for the Commission's credibility that it should be seen to be responding positively, although there were limitations as to what could be done by the Commission, whose competence was nomenclatural rather than taxonomic. A register of available names might present one way of responding to such a situation in the future, as also might the development of a system of registering acceptable publications in specified journals.

No formal application for the suppression of the works under Article 79 of the Code had yet been received by the Secretariat. Article 80 would apply when the receipt of such an application was published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature.*

11 *Specialist Nomenclature Committees*

The President outlined his proposition that a greater involvement of zoologists in the decision-making processes of the Commission, and a wider consciousness of the importance of the work of the Commission, would be obtained by the development of nomenclature committees to advise the Commission on cases in special fields. Relevant applications would be sent to the nomenclature committees before publication so that the applications could be developed and improved where necessary.

A paper prepared by the Secretariat showed that a small number of taxonomic groups accounted for the great majority of the applications to the Commission. On this basis, it was considered that 9 nomenclature committees should be set up, covering Mammals; Birds; Reptiles and Amphibia; Fishes; Insects; Crustacea; Arachnids and Arthropods (other than Insects and Crustacea but including Trilobites); Molluscs and Brachiopods; and Protists. Applications concerning other taxonomic groups would be dealt with by the advisory mechanism available through Bylaw 30.

It was important that the nomenclature committees should make their recommendations to the Commission and would be committees of the Council. However, this would not negate the possibility of those nomenclature committees which already existed in certain areas performing this role. It was RESOLVED that the Council would approach existing committees through their parent bodies and would itself set up nomenclature committees in those areas where none existed, the Secretariat initiating action as soon as possible.

12 *Official Lists of Names in Zoology*

Members welcomed the intention to publish in 1986 a new and up-dated edition of the Official Lists and Indexes. In preparing the entries, the Secretariat had uncovered a number of anomalous points including omissions, corrections of fact and points of editorial inconsistency.

It was agreed that these should be dealt with by the Secretariat rather than through a vote by the Commission. In the event of alterations, the entries should make it clear, by reference to the earlier entry, that a deliberate alteration had been made to the text. A further issue related to the "Declaration 21" problem. Article 67e of the 1961 and 1964 editions of the Code required that if a nominal species which is the type of a genus is found to be a junior objective synonym, the senior synonym must be cited as the name of the type species of the genus in question. This provision was deleted in the 1985 edition of the Code which provides in a Recommendation that the type species when cited in its original binomen be accompanied by the senior objective synonym. To adopt the new rule retrospectively would affect 19 names in 10 Opinions. It was agreed that the status of these names that had been fixed by Opinions should be sustained by a relevant reference in each entry to Article 78i (Previous decisions of the Commission).

13 *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*

Members discussed the Bulletin and considered that both the contents and the format could be improved to make it more useful and attractive, thus widening the circulation. This would increase not merely the income from subscriptions but also the dissemination of information.

The Secretariat reported that this view was shared by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature which had set up a working party to examine the issue. Dr R. B. Manning, President of the American Association for Zoological Nomenclature and a member of the Trust, had undertaken to gather the views of zoologists in North America.

The main points developed in the ensuing discussion concerned:

a) The possibility of widening the contents of the Bulletin to include more general articles on nomenclature or perhaps, as with *Taxon*, articles on systematics, possibly in conjunction with a learned society.

b) The need for much wider distribution of the Opinions which were a main end-product of the Commission's work.

c) The desirability of being able to subscribe to sub-sections of the Bulletin each covering particular taxonomic groups.

d) A number of editorial points such as grouping the contents page into taxonomic categories, putting the editor's name on the volume, and a blanket statement of certification covering all Opinions in any one part of the Bulletin.

These comments and any others which members wished to send to the Secretariat would be considered there and by the Trust's working party. It was hoped that a report would be made to the Trust by the Summer of 1986 so that any changes agreed could be implemented in time for the 1987 volume.

14 *Names of Higher Taxa*

Dr Starobogatov suggested that names of taxa higher than the family-group names should be covered by the Code. This would be particularly valuable for computer retrieval. Dr Lehtinen said that many Scandinavian zoologists were opposed to an extension of the Code to cover names of higher taxa.

Dr Starobogatov was invited to initiate a debate by submitting an article for publication in the Bulletin.

15 *Biological Nomenclature*

A Workshop on Biological Nomenclature was held on the morning of 4 September when the Commission was joined by a number of other biologists, including several botanists.

Dr Ride initiated a discussion by referring to Resolutions 5 and 6 of the IUBS General Assembly at Ottawa on Common Approaches to Biological Nomenclature and the need to assist the organizations responsible for biological nomenclature. He circulated the report of the Ad hoc Committee on Biological Nomenclature which he chaired, with Dr Rita Colwell and Dr W. Greuter as members (to be published Biology International, 1986). The main recommendations related to the need to undertake a study of the Botanical and Zoological Codes to harmonize them as far as possible and the desirability of registering names of taxa and ultimately making such regulation mandatory.

In the course of detailed discussion, the main points made were:

a) It would not be practicable for zoologists and botanists to use a common Code but some of the main differences could be reduced or, in some cases, eliminated.

b) Developing technology and changes in the Codes relating to the definition of publication were likely to lead to a great increase in the number of new taxa and names, some of doubtful validity. It was desirable to develop a system of registering new names, perhaps eventually extending this to names already existing. Dr Cogger thought that it was essential to develop a mechanism which took account of irresponsible or incompetent taxonomy, although he recognised that this was primarily a taxonomic matter which was highly subjective.

c) There might be merit in restricting the number of journals and publications in which new names could be published or of requiring new names to be listed in particular journals before they were accepted as valid.

It was agreed that IUBS should be asked to fund a feasibility study to examine the scope for developing a register of names.

Dr Corliss referred to his working party on the Nomenclature of Protists and circulated a preliminary report.

APPENDIX

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Statutes of the Section of Zoological Nomenclature
(Adopted at the XXII General Assembly, Budapest, 4 September 1985)

Article 1 The Section constitutes the Section of Nomenclature specified in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature and the Constitution of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

Article 2 At each General Assembly of IUBS, or at other congresses as prescribed in Article 4, the Section of Zoological Nomenclature shall carry out the functions and duties of the Section of Nomenclature set out in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature and in the Constitution of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. In particular, the Section shall receive and discuss proposals from the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and shall submit recommendations concerning them to IUBS.

Article 3 The members of the Section are:

(a) Members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

(b) At a General Assembly of IUBS, any zoologists being members of national or other delegations, Sections or Commissions of the Union.

(c) Any zoologists admitted by the Commission.

Article 4

(a) A Session of the Section shall be held between the opening of a General Assembly of IUBS and its closing.

(b) Providing all members of the Commission are notified in advance, Sessions may, at the discretion of the President of the Commission, begin before and continue after a General Assembly or an international congress as prescribed in this Article.

(c) Provided all members of the Commission are notified in advance, Sessions may be convened by the President to be held in conjunction with international congresses convened by a Scientific Member of IUBS.

Article 5 There is no limit to the number of General Assemblies, or international congresses as prescribed in Article 4, at which an individual may serve as a member of the Section.

Article 6

(a) The Chairman of the Section shall be the President of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

(b) In the absence of the President, the Vice-President of the Commission shall be Chairman.

(c) In the absence of both the President and the Vice-President, the Section shall elect a Chairman at the meeting.

Article 7

(a) At any Session the Section may consider nominations to the Commission presented by the Commission in accordance with its Constitution and Bylaws, providing that any elections to the Commission shall be made between the opening of a General Assembly of IUBS, or an international congress as prescribed in Article 4, and its closing.

(b) In elections no one shall vote if he is a candidate.

(c) The voting procedures of the Section shall be in accordance with the Constitution and Bylaws of the Commission.

(d) Membership of the Commission of persons elected at a Session other than during a General Assembly of IUBS shall take effect at the close of the General Assembly next held.

FINANCIAL REPORT FOR YEAR ENDING 31 DECEMBER 1984

Income from sales of publications was slightly greater than in 1983 but made up differently. As in 1983, £10,000 was received under the agreement with the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux by which they print and market the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. From this have been deducted outstanding debts from 1982 to give a net figure of £9,572. The figure of £2,377 for 'International Codes' was composed of interest of £2,364 on money earmarked for printing of the 3rd Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature and £13 from sale of Amendment to the 2nd Edition of the Code. Grants were received from the International Union of Biological Sciences, the Royal Society of London and the four British research councils (IUBS £3,166; Royal Society £1,000; Agricultural and Food Research Council £2,000; Medical Research Council £2,000, plus £2,000 for 1983; Natural Environment Research Council £2,000; Science and Engineering Research Council £2,000). The Appeal Fund received no large deferred covenants in 1984, so the receipts decreased from £41,793 to £8,687. Ordinary deeds of covenant (exempt from tax under British law) brought in £3,575 (£2,880 in 1983). Bank and other interest on reserves increased to £9,777 (£4,410 in 1983). Salaries and fees increased from £14,852 to £20,012 as a result of staff changes. £1,174 was provided to write off bad debts that have accumulated over a number of years. Most of these stem from 1981 when the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux undertook to publish and market the *Bulletin* and there was a change from payment in arrears to payment in advance. Strenuous efforts have been and are being made to collect these debts and already (1985) some have been paid, but it becomes increasingly difficult to locate individuals who have changed their addresses.

The surplus for the year was £26,693 against £50,194 in 1983. Accumulated reserves total £128,793 against £106,697. The greater part of the reserves are invested in National Savings Income Bonds or on deposit as 7-day money with Coutts Finance. Working capital is deposited or on current account with Coutts & Co., Bankers, London.

Anticipated changes in 1985 include income from sales of the 3rd Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. Payment from the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux will be less by £5,000 but grants from IUBS, the Royal Society and the British research councils will continue at about the same rate as in 1984. Interest on reserves will be much the same as in 1984, but income from the Appeal cannot be forecast and is likely to be less than in 1984. £1,400 is expected for work done on the nomenclature of parasitic diseases for the Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences. Tentative total income is forecast as £54,606. Expenditure on wages and salaries will increase as a result of Mr R. V. Melville's retirement as Secretary of the Commission and the appointment of a successor who will have to be paid more realistically. For various reasons office expenditure is likely to be greater than in 1984. Unusual expenses in 1985 include preliminary work on the Official Lists of Names in Zoology which it is proposed to bring up to date and publish, foreign travel (IUBS General Assembly, Budapest) and conference expenses (ICSEB III, University of Sussex). Total office expenses are forecast to be £13,500 and publication of the Code has cost more than £12,165. The total outgoings are forecast as £51,065 and the excess of income over expenditure £3,541.

The Trust will have no difficulty in meeting all its expenses in 1985 and 1986, although 1986 may be a difficult year. We cannot be certain of a payment from the Commonwealth Agricultural Bureaux with whom agreement to publish and market the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* is being re-negotiated. Nor can we be certain of grants from IUBS, the Royal Society and the British research councils. If all are lost, income will decrease by some £18,500. Income from the Appeal is also likely to diminish further.

During 1984 and 1985, the Trust has taken the opportunity to increase the efficiency of the office and this will speed work on zoological nomenclature, may increase income from publications and help to meet the challenge of changes proposed in the organization of the International Commission.

F. G. W. JONES
Secretary
22 June 1985
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE
BALANCE SHEET AS AT 31st DECEMBER 1984

	1983			
		FIXED ASSETS		
		Office Equipment at cost	1,259	
		Additions during the year	1,050	
			2,309	
		Less: Accumulated Depreciation	802	
	625			1,507
		CURRENT ASSETS		
1,707		Amounts due from Sales	72	
1,452		Income and other Taxes recoverable	2,086	
85,000		Investments	122,000	
21,513		Cash at Bank and in Hand	6,015	
	109,672			130,173
	110,297			131,680
		CURRENT LIABILITIES		
125		Sundry Creditors	202	
3,475		Deposited Covenants received in advance	2,685	
	3,600			2,887
	£106,697			£128,793
		ACCUMULATED FUNDS		
		REVENUE RESERVE		
	38,344	Balance at 31st December, 1983		88,538
	50,194	Surplus for 1984		24,693
	88,538			113,231
	18,159	Specific Provision (see Note)		15,562
	£106,697			£128,793

NOTE: The provision for printing the 3rd Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature is made up as follows:

Specific Donations	9,359
Appropriation from Trust Funds	7,000
Less: Accumulated direct costs	(797)
	£15,562

H. B. WHITTINGTON
DENNIS CURRY

Members of the
Management Committee

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE
INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31st DECEMBER 1984

	1983			
		SALE OF PUBLICATIONS		
11,306		Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature	9,572	
13		International Codes	2,377	
—		Official Lists	98	
1		Opinions	5	
	11,320			12,052
7,000		GRANTS	14,166	
41,793		APPEAL FUND	8,687	
2,880		DEEDS OF COVENANT	3,575	
4,410		INTEREST	9,779	
	56,083			36,207
	67,403			48,259
		Less:		
14,852		SALARIES AND FEES	20,012	
2,145		OFFICE EXPENSES	2,072	
125		AUDIT FEE	140	
—		PROVISION FOR BAD DEBTS	1,174	
18		PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLICATIONS	—	
69		DEPRECIATION OF OFFICE EQUIPMENT	168	
	17,209			23,566
	£50,194	SURPLUS FOR THE YEAR carried to BALANCE SHEET		£24,693

REPORT OF THE AUDITORS

In our opinion the Accounts of the Trust which have been prepared under the historical cost convention give a true and fair view of the state of affairs at 31st December, 1984 and of the operating surplus for the year ended on that date and comply with the Companies Acts 1948 to 1980.

3, Kings Head Yard,
London, SE1 1NA

11th June, 1985

MORLEY, GRAYRIGGE & CO.,
Chartered Accountants

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 70b: FREEDOM FOR AN AUTHOR TO ACT WITHOUT REFERENCE TO THE COMMISSION IN THE CASE OF A MISIDENTIFIED TYPE SPECIES

Z.N.(S.)2477

(see vol. 41, pp. 156–158; vol. 42, pp. 12, 125)

By W. D. L. Ride (*Canberra College of Advanced Education, P.O. Box 1, Belconnen, ACT 2616, Australia*)

Sabrosky's application to amend Art. 70b (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 41, pp. 156–158) and the Secretary's support (but not necessarily for Sabrosky's solution, *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 41, p. 158) reflects the awareness that developed in the Editorial Committee, during the final stages of preparation of the 3rd Edition, of a general need for the Code to provide for an automatic solution to be followed prior to the Commission's final determination. Article 80 requires existing usage to be maintained once a case is before the Commission, but that does not solve the problem for the preparers of catalogues, etc., who may not be able to defer publication for the 2 years or more before a decision is reached by the Commission, or for those who wish to take an undisputed line on their own initiatives.

2. In the case of Article 70b, the present Article requires a zoologist who discovers that a generic name is misapplied because its nominal type species does not belong to the genus-group taxon for which the name is in use, to refer the matter for determination to the Commission (together with a recommendation as to the course of action to provide the best remedy).

3. Sabrosky (*op. cit.*) and Wright (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 42, p. 12) have argued different solutions. A third solution is adopted by the authors and editors to which Sabrosky refers. The solutions are:

(1) Wright's solution that an author is to follow Article 70a irrespective of the discovery (it would then be up to any other author, disagreeing with that action, to make a case for conservation and, thereby, to stop the new usage by automatically invoking Article 80 to maintain current usage);

(2) Sabrosky's solution that an author should maintain current usage and publish the evidence of misapplication and at the same time designate a replacement nominal type species (which would be fixed by that action unless subsequently set aside by the Commission acting on an appeal). In the event of an appeal, Article 80 would be invoked and would maintain current usage until a decision was reached; and

(3) the solution adopted in the Catalogues of Diptera referred to by Sabrosky, that an author may use judgement as to whether there is sufficient stable usage to justify the use of solution (2); if not, solution (1) would be adopted. Appeals against either action would automatically maintain current usage.

4. In commenting on Sabrosky's proposal, the Secretary of the Commission drew attention to possible conflicts between it and Articles 67 and 69 (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 41, p. 158).

5. I agree with Wright that the editors of the catalogues mentioned in Sabrosky's application should have followed the letter of the Code. But their actions highlight the need to amend Art. 70b for the reasons given by Sabrosky as well as in the interests of economy in the work-load of the Commission. Had the editors referred to by Sabrosky followed Art. 70b they would have referred some 76 additional cases (with arguments) to the Commission. Quite apart from the delays this course would have introduced, it would have been a costly proposition. I concur with both Sabrosky and Wright that a solution must be found that will enable a zoologist to take a definitive action that will be maintained under the Code unless an appeal against it is upheld by the Commission.

6. My comments on the three solutions are:

Solution (1):

While nomenclaturally tidy, solution (1) is not in keeping with what is expected of nomenclature today by zoologists in general.

Solution (2):

Solution (2) is conformable with the spirit of the modern Code. However in making that statement I share Wright's concern that the introduction of such an amendment must not, at the same time, encourage authors to accept the operation of that solution as an invitation to discard objectivity. The solution must require the author to replace one nominal type species with another nominal type species and recognise that the consequence of that action will determine the future use of the generic name under all circumstances. The new type species must not, itself, become at some later date 'a misidentified type species' or productive of the very confusion that the proposal seeks to avoid.

To a large extent the problem raised by Wright, and in particular dangers in inviting changes to type species, results from the difficulty for zoologists to comprehend from the Code that, even though the nominal genus is interpreted by an entity called a nominal species (and not by a taxonomic species), a nominal species is not itself any sort of a species in the ordinary sense of a population but only the conjunction of a specimen (the name bearer: holotype, type, neotype, or syntypes) and a name. The consequences of any sloppy methodology of the sort that Wright fears are very clear. To behave responsibly, such an author must go back to the name bearer of the nominal species that is regarded as the desirable type species and verify its identity.

Solution (3):

Solution (3) more closely resembles Art. 23b in giving authors the option of following the 'normal' provisions of the Code (but subject to appeal), if, in their judgement, serious upset would not result from the discovery. However authors wishing to put into effect Solution 2 (again, subject to appeal) may do so legitimately.

7. If such a solution were to be adopted, the question remains whether the author adopting solution 2 should be required (as in Art. 23b) to 'register' the action in the appropriate Official List or Index by invoking some such procedure as the *prima facie* provision of Art. 79. I think not. Providing the action taken to depart from the original type species is made explicit in the work and the basis of the 'misidentification' established (to rule out the automatic acceptance of sloppy 'misdesignations' of type species) I see no reason why the procedure should not be covered under the principle of the first reviser.

ARTICLE 70b: COMMENT ON DR RIDE'S SUGGESTION

By R. V. Melville (*formerly Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

Dr Ride suggests that the caseload of genera based on misidentified type species can be lightened if cases could be dealt with under the Principle of the First Reviser. That principle provides a device for dealing with names or nomenclatural acts published simultaneously — i.e. for deciding which of two or more simultaneous names or acts shall have precedence over the other(s). It is not designed to deal with problems affecting single names, such as those involved in most cases of misidentified type species. I should deprecate the extension of the principle in that way because it would introduce a taxonomic element into the judgement of the first reviser. There is a widespread impression that the act of the first *taxonomic* reviser has a nomenclatural effect, but this is only rarely true. Taxonomic and nomenclatural revisions should be kept separate as far as possible.

Dr Vockeroth's suggestion (vol. 42, p. 123) would not diminish the caseload because it merely refers all cases to Article 70b. I believe that a more effective solution is to be found by adding provisions to Articles 68 and 69, on the following lines:

Article 68

(f) Misidentified type species. — Notwithstanding the provisions of Sections e and g of Article 67, if a type species fixed in accordance with the provisions of the present Article is found to have been misidentified, the species actually involved is deemed to represent the nominal type species, whether it represents an originally included nominal species or not.

(i) If the identity of the species actually involved is doubtful or disputed, the case is to be referred to the Commission and the provisions of Article 70b will apply.

An analogous provision could be added to Article 69 as Section c with the addition of a reference to Article 69a(i) in the second line.

OPINION 1354

AGROTIS REDIMICULA MORRISON, 1874 (LEPIDOPTERA): CONSERVED FROM 1874

RULING. — Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the specific name *redimicula* Morrison, as published in the binomen *Agrotis redimicula,* is a justified emendation of the specific name *redimacula* Morrison, 1874, as published in the binomen *Agrotis redimacula.*

(2) The specific name *redimicula* Morrison, 1874 as published in the binomen *Agrotis redimicula,* and as validated under the plenary powers in (1) above is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3022.

(3) The specific name *redimacula* Morrison, 1874, as published in the binomen *Agrotis redimacula,* and as invalidated by the ruling under the plenary powers in (1) above is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1161.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2305

An application for the conservation of *Agrotis redimicula* Morrison, 1874 was first received from Dr J. D. Lafontaine (*Biosystematics Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada*) on 15 May 1979. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 24 February 1981 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 54–56. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and nine entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 January 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)3 for or against the use of plenary powers in the case and then for either alternatives (1)(a), (2) and (3) set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.,* vol. 39, pp. 54–55 or for alternatives (1)(b), (2) and (3) set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, p. 55. At the close of the voting period on 15 April 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes for alternatives (1)(a), (2) and (3) — nine (9) received in the following order: Holthuis, Brinck, Savage, Willink, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Corliss, Dupuis

Affirmative Votes for alternatives (1)(b), (2) and (3) — twelve (12) received in the following order: Melville, Lehtinen, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Alvarado, Kraus, Heppell, Bernardi, Schuster, Ride

Affirmative votes for (1)(b) only — one (1) Cogger

Uéno voted against the use of the plenary powers.

A late affirmative vote for alternatives (1)(a), (2) and (3) was returned by Halvorsen.

A late affirmative vote for alternatives (1)(b), (2) and (3) was returned by Binder.

Heppell commented: 'If the plenary powers are used to conserve the spelling *"redimicula"* from 1874, the "alternatives" presented to the Commission seem to be nonsense. The original spelling of the name is *"redimacula"*. If the Commission decides this is an incorrect original spelling, the correct orthography *"redimicula"* is ipso facto a justified emendation. It may be deemed to be "correct" but to deem it "original" is patently absurd. I presume *"redimicula"* must be treated as indeclinable [Article 31b], being neither adjectival nor, unlike *"unimacula"*, a noun in apposition (as "redimiculum" is a neuter noun). It is unfortunate that this ambiguity is not covered in the proposed ruling.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

redimacula, Agrotis, Morrison, 1874, *Proc. Bost. Soc. nat. Hist.*, vol. 17, p. 165

redimicula, Agrotis, Morrison, 1874, *ibid.*, p. 165.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)3 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1354.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
18 June 1985

OPINION 1355
LINGULA ANATINA LAMARCK, 1801 IS THE TYPE SPECIES OF *LINGULA* BRUGUIÈRE, [1797] (BRACHIOPODA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers:

(a) all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Lingula* Bruguière, [1797] are hereby set aside and *Lingula anatina* Lamarck, 1801 is hereby designated as type species of that genus;

(b) the specific name *lingua* Lightfoot, 1786, as published in the binomen *Mytilus lingua*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The generic name *Lingula* Bruguière, [1797] (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(a) above, *Lingula anatina* Lamarck, 1801, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2288.

(3) The specific name *anatina* Lamarck, 1801, as published in the binomen *Lingula anatina* (specific name of type species of *Lingula* Bruguière, [1797]) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3023.

(4) The specific name *lingua* Lightfoot, 1786, as published in the binomen *Mytilus lingua*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1162.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1598

An application for the use of the plenary powers to designate *Lingula anatina* Lamarck, 1801 as the type species of *Lingula* Bruguière, [1797] was first received from Dr A. J. Rowell (then of the *University of Nottingham, England*) on 6 December 1963. It was sent to the printer on 17 December 1963 and published on 7 August 1964 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 21, pp. 222–224. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, two malacological serials and two palaeontological serials. No comment was received.

FIRST VOTE OF THE COMMISSION

On 10 March 1966 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule in Voting Paper (66)20 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 21, p. 223. At the close of the voting period on 10 June 1966 there were 20 votes in favour and none against, with two late affirmative votes and three voting papers not returned.

During the voting period a note was received from Dr Harald Rehder (*U.S. National Museum, Washington D.C.*) pointing out that *Mytilus lingua* Lightfoot, 1786 was a senior subjective synonym of *Lingula anatina* Lamarck, 1801. For reasons that cannot now be ascertained, this caused the case to be put away and forgotten.

REOPENING OF THE CASE

In December 1979 Dr Rex Doescher (*National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C.*) wrote to enquire of the fate of Dr Rowell's application. He sent copies of letters from Dr Rowell and Dr C. Emig (*Station marine d'Endoume, Marseille, France*) recommending the suppression of *Mytilus lingua* Lightfoot, 1786 — a view expressed directly to the Secretary by Dr L. S. Hammond (James Cook University of North Queensland, Australia). A report on the case was accordingly prepared and published on 7 December 1982 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 302–304. A comment from Dr L. B. Holthuis pointed out that the nomenclatural status of *Mytilus lingua* was quite independent from the question of the nominal type species of *Lingula*. Considering the uncertain identity of *M. lingua*, however, he thought it even better to retain *L. anatina* as the type species of *Lingula*. No other comments were received.

SECOND AND THIRD VOTES OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule in Voting Paper (1984)57 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, p. 303. The fact that two mutually exclusive alternatives were put forward was unfortunately overlooked. The members were in fact asked to vote, first, for or against the use of the plenary powers in the case, and then either for the suppression of *Mytilus lingua* Lightfoot, 1786 or for the grant of precedence over it to *Lingula anatina* Lamarck, 1801. Several members wrote to draw attention to the defective preparation of the voting paper, which was accordingly withdrawn.

On 11 March 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule in Voting Paper (1985)21 in Part 1 for or against the use of the plenary powers in the case, and in Part 2 either (a) for the suppression of *Mytilus lingua* Lightfoot, 1786 or (b) for the grant of precedence over it to *Lingula anatina* Lamarck. At the close of the voting period on 11 June 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Part 1

Affirmative Votes — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Brinck, Holthuis, Alvarado, Willink, Uéno, Corliss, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Cogger, Bernardi, Halvorsen, Binder, Schuster, Trjapitzin, Bayer, Ride, Lehtinen, Dupuis

Negative Votes — two (2): Sabrosky, Savage.

Part 2

For alternative (a) — twelve (12): Melville, Cocks, Brinck, Alvarado, Corliss, Cogger, Bernardi, Halvorsen, Schuster, Trjapitzin, Ride, Lehtinen

For alternative (b) — eight (8): Holthuis, Willink, Uéno, Mroczkowski, Hahn, Kraus, Binder, Bayer.

Dupuis returned a late affirmative vote for Part 1 and Part 2(b). No votes were returned by Heppell and Starobogatov.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

anatina, Lingula, Lamarck, 1801, *Système des animaux sans vertèbres,* p. 141

lingua, Mytilus, Lightfoot, 1786, *Catalogue of the Portland Museum,* p. 77

Lingula Bruguière, [1797], *Tabl. encycl. trois règnes de la nature,* Vers, Coquilles, Mollusques et Polypiers, pl. 250.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast in Voting Paper (85)21 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion 1355.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
26 June 1985

OPINION 1356
DACTYLOPUSIA NORMAN, 1903 (CRUSTACEA, COPEPODA): TYPE SPECIES DESIGNATED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Dactylopusia* Norman, 1903 are hereby set aside and *Dactylopus tisboides* Claus, 1863 is hereby designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *Dactylopusia* Norman, 1903 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Dactylopus tisboides* Claus, 1863 (Name Number 2289);
- (b) *Heterolaophonte* Lang, 1948 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Cyclops stroemii* Baird, 1837 (Name Number 2290).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *tisboides* Claus, 1863, as published in the binomen *Dactylopus tisboides* (specific name of the type species of *Dactylopusia* Norman, 1903) (Name Number 3024);
- (b) *stroemii* Baird, 1837, as published in the binomen *Cyclops stroemii* (specific name of the type species of *Heterolaophonte* Lang, 1948) (Name Number 3025).

(4) The subfamily name DACTYLOPUSIINAE Lang, 1936 (corrected by Vervoort, 1963 from 'DACTYLOPODIINAE') (type genus *Dactylopusia* Norman, 1903) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 588.

(5) The subfamily name DACTYLOPODIINAE Lang, 1936 (an incorrect original spelling of DACTYLOPUSIINAE) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group names in Zoology with the Name Number 505.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1517

An application for the use of the plenary powers to designate a type species for *Dactylopusia* Norman, 1903 was first received from Dr W. Vervoort (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden*) on 26 January 1962. This was sent to the printer on 9 March 1962 and published on 11 April 1963 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 20, pp. 145–147. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was sent to the statutory serials and to one specialist serial. A comment raising certain objections to the case was received from the then Dr Per Brinck (*University of Lund, Sweden*) and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 21, p. 193. No further comments were received.

On 5 October 1964 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1964) 20 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 20, pp. 146–147. At the close of the voting period on 5 January 1965 the result of the voting was fifteen affirmative votes and 10 negative. Two Commissioners did not return their voting papers and one abstained. A less than two-thirds majority was therefore secured and no Opinion was written.

On 1 April 1982 a revised version of the application was received under the joint authorship of Dr W. Vervoort and Dr L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden*). It was sent to the printers on 14 January 1983 and published on 29 March 1983 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 40, pp. 56–57. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and one specialist serial. No comment was received even though the case was announced in *Monoculus,* the copepod newsletter.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 April 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)23 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, p. 57. At the close of the voting period on 15 July 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-two (22) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Holthuis, Halvorsen, Binder, Savage, Trjapitzin, Mroczkowski, Corliss, Lehtinen, Ride, Alvarado, Willink, Hahn, Schuster, Gruchy, Uéno, Brinck, Kraus, Bayer, Heppell, Bernardi

Negative Votes — one (1) Dupuis.

A late affirmative vote was returned by Cogger.

No vote was returned by Starobogatov.

Dupuis commented: 'Dans les cas d'espèces types mal identifiées, j'admets, par principe, l'identification correcte. Ici, je vote contre, car il s'agit de tout autre chose: remplacer, en *nomenclature,* une espèce type par une autre pour éluder, en *taxinomie,* le problème — simplement possible à l'avenir — de la délimitation de la première (cela revient à créer un "néotype" pour un genre).

'Les requérants déclarent: "It is not our purpose, nor is it the business of the Commission, to examine the taxonomic problems affecting *C. stroemii* or *D. vulgaris*".

'Les deux exemples cités démontrent que cette déclaration est incorrecte en ce qu'elle confond, sous la formule "taxonomic problems", deux sortes de problèmes:

'a) le problème du statut nomenclatorial d'une espèce type mal identifiée ("misidentified *Cyclops stroemii*"), que est du ressort de la Commission;

'b) le problème du statut taxinomique de n'importe quelle espèce, problème qui, effectivement, échappe à la compétence de la Commission.

Les requérants, en n'examinant pas la "suitability" taxinomique de *D. tisboides*, respectent le principe de la non-ingérence de la Commission dans les problèmes taxinomiques, mais, en tenant pour pertinente à la discussion l'idée que *D. vulgaris* "may be a composite species", ils contredisent ce principe. Pour masquer cette contradiction, ils introduisent l'argument — inconnu en nomenclature — de la "suitability" future des taxa et négligent la règle reconnue, et tout à fait indépendante, de "l'availability" actuelle des noms.

'En droit nomenclatorial, le nom de *D. vulgaris* est available comme celui d'une espèce type, même si, taxinomiquement, l'espèce qu'il désigne aujourd'hui doit nécessiter plus tard une révision (par exemple au prix de la désignation d'un lectotype). La stabilité du nom générique typifié exige le maintien de ce type.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion.

DACTYLOPODIINAE Lang, 1936, *Further zool. results of the Swedish Antarctic Exped.*, vol. 3(3), pp. 22, 29
Dactylopusia Norman, 1903, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist* (7), vol. 11, p. 368
DACTYLOPUSIINAE Lang, 1936, *ibid.*, pp. 22, 29
Heterolaophonte Lang, 1948, *Monographie der Harpacticiden*, p. 1364
stroemii, Cyclops, Baird, 1837, *Mag. Zool. Bot.*, vol. 1, p. 330
tisboides, Dactylopus, Claus, 1863, *Die frei lebenden Copepoden*, p. 126.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)23 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1356.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
1 August 1985

OPINION 1357
ANUROPODIDAE BACESCU, 1980 (CRUSTACEA, TANAIDACEA) AND ANUROPODIDAE STEBBING, 1893 (CRUSTACEA, ISOPODA);
A RULING TO REMOVE THE HOMONYMY

RULING. — Under the plenary powers, the stem of the generic name *Anuropus* Beddard, 1886 (Isopoda) for the purposes of Article 29 is hereby ruled to be ANUROP.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Anuropoda* Bacescu, 1980 (Tanaidacea) (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Anuropoda francispori* Bacescu, 1980 (Name Number 2291);

(b) *Anuropus* Beddard, 1886 (Isopoda) (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Anuropus branchiatus* Beddard, 1886 (Name Number 2292).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *francispori* Bacescu, 1980, as published in the binomen *Anuropoda francispori* (specific name of the type species of *Anuropoda* Bacescu, 1980) (Name Number 3026);

(b) *branchiatus* Beddard, 1886, as published in the binomen *Anuropus branchiatus* (specific name of the type species of *Anuropus* Beddard, 1886) (Name Number 3027).

(4) The following family-group names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) ANUROPIDAE Stebbing, 1893 (type genus *Anuropus* Beddard) (Isopoda), spelling legalised under the plenary powers in (1) above (Name Number 589);

(b) ANUROPODIDAE Bacescu, 1980 (type genus *Anuropoda* Bacescu, 1980) (Tanaidacea) (Name Number 590).

(5) The family-group name ANUROPODINAE (correction by Calman, 1907 of ANUROPIDAE) Stebbing, 1893 (Isopoda), an incorrect spelling as a consequence of the ruling given under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 506.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2429

An application for the use of the plenary powers to remove the homonymy involving ANUROPODIDAE Bacescu, 1980 (Tanaidacea) and ANUROPODIDAE Stebbing, 1893 (Isopoda) was first received from Dr M. Bacescu (*Musée d'Histoire Naturelle, Bucharest, Romania*), Dr J. Sieg

(*Universität Osnabrück, FRG*) and Dr L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden*) on 22 November 1982. It was sent to the printers on 14 January 1983 and published on 29 March 1983 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 40, pp. 58–59. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and one specialist serial. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 April 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)24 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, p. 59. At the close of the voting period on 15 July 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-two (22) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Holthuis, Halvorsen, Binder, Savage, Gruchy, Trjapitzin, Mroczkowski, Corliss, Lehtinen, Ride, Alvarado, Willink, Hahn, Schuster, Uéno, Brinck, Kraus, Bayer, Heppell, Bernardi

Negative Votes — one (1) Dupuis.

A late affirmative vote was returned by Cogger.

No vote was returned by Starobogatov.

Dupuis commented: 'Je vote contre la solution proposée, comme ne résolvant pas l'ambigüité, puis qu'il se trouvera toujours des zoologistes instruits qui, spontanément, corrigeront ANUROPIDAE Stebbing en ANUROPODIDAE. Il eût été préférable de conserver ANUROPODIDAE Stebbing et de créer ANUROPODAIDAE.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on the Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

ANUROPIDAE Stebbing, 1893, *History of Crustacea*, p. 345

Anuropoda Bacescu, 1980, *Trav. Mus. Hist. nat. Bucuresti*, vol. 22, p. 381

ANUROPODIDAE Bacescu, 1980, *Trav. Mus. Hist. nat. Bucuresti*, vol. 22, p. 384

ANUROPODINAE Calman, 1907, *Lankester's Treatise on Zoology*, vol. 7, p. 210

Anuropus Beddard, 1886, *Proc. zool. Soc. London*, 1886, p. 112

branchiatus, Anuropus, Beddard, 1886, *Proc. zool. Soc. London*, 1886, p. 384

francispori, Anuropoda, Bacescu, 1980, *Trav. Mus. Hist. nat. Bucuresti*, vol. 22, p. 384.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)24 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1357.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
1 August 1985

OPINION 1358

CALAPHIS WALSH, 1862 AND *CALLAPHIS* WALKER, 1870 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA): A RULING TO REMOVE THE CONFUSION

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the generic name *Callaphis* Walker, 1870, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified.

- (a) *Panaphis* Kirkaldy, 1904 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Aphis juglandis* Goeze, 1778 (Name Number 2293)
- (b) *Calaphis* Walsh, 1862 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Calaphis betulella* Walsh, 1862 (Name Number 2294)

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *juglandis* Goeze, 1778, as published in the binomen *Aphis juglandis* (specific name of the type species of *Panaphis* Kirkaldy, 1904 (Name Number 3028);
- (b) *betulella* Walsh, 1862, as published in the binomen *Calaphis betulella* (specific name of the type species of *Calaphis* Walsh, 1862) (Name Number 3029).

(4) The generic name *Callaphis* Walker, 1870, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology, with the Name Number 2171.

(5) The following family-group names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) CALAPHIDINI Oestlund, 1918 (type genus *Calaphis* Walsh, 1862) (Name Number 591).
- (b) PANAPHIDINI Oestlund, 1922 (type genus *Panaphis* Kirkaldy, 1904) (Name Number 592).

(6) The family-group name CALLAPHIDINAE Börner, 1952 is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 507.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N(S.)2153

An application for the use of the plenary powers to remove the confusion caused by the existence of *Calaphis* Walsh, 1862 and *Callaphis* Walker, 1870 in the same aphid subfamily was first received from Dr F. W. Quednau (*Laurentian Forest Research Centre, Canada*) in the form of an initial enquiry, on 10 April 1975. A detailed draft application was subsequently prepared and sent to the printer on 14 January 1983 and published on 29 March 1983 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 40, pp. 60–61. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and nine entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 April 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)25 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, pp. 60–61. At the close of the voting period on 15 July 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Holthuis, Halvorsen, Binder, Savage, Trjapitzin, Mroczkowski, Corliss, Ride, Alvarado, Willink, Hahn, Schuster, Uéno, Brinck, Bayer, Heppell, Bernardi

Negative Votes — three (3) received in the following order: Gruchy, Lehtinen, Kraus.

A late affirmative vote was returned by Cogger.

Dupuis abstained. No vote was returned by Starobogatov. .

The following comments were returned by the Commissioners with their voting papers:

Dupuis: 'Je m'abstiens pour les raisons suivantes:

'Etant donné que *Callaphis* est étymologiquement la graphie la plus correcte, il est à présumer que spontanément, des zoologistes instruits continueront à écrire *Callaphis*, même pour *Calaphis* Walsh, de sorte que la solution proposée n'écarte pas définitivement tout risque de confusion.

'Plutôt que d'utiliser les pleins pouvoirs, simplement pour la suppression automatique d'un "homonyme" plus récent, il eût été judicieux de les mettre à profit pour l'une ou l'autre des procèdures ci-aprés:

'a) Déclarer que la graphie correcte de *Calaphis* Walsh était *Callaphis*. De ce fait, *Callaphis* Walker, tombait en homonymie et n'avait pas à être supprimé.

'b) examiner s'il existait des synonymes de *Calaphis* Walsh et si, en même temps, *Callaphis* Walker avait un usage plus fréquent que *Calaphis* Walsh (la requête ne dit rien de ces deux points). Dans ce cas, l'on pouvait supprimer *Calaphis* Walsh plutôt que *Callaphis* Walker'.

Gruchy: 'I am sympathetic to the idea of "removing confusion" that arises as a result of similar names of genera (particularly within a single subfamily) as elucidated in the present application, but the problems that the "confusion" has caused have not been stated. In this circumstance, I prefer to adhere more to the letter than (necessarily) the intent of the Code.'

Lehtinen: 'The difference between single and double consonant is sufficient to separate hundreds of common words in many languages. I cannot see any reason to make an exception in this case.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and Official Indexes by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

betulella, Calaphis, Walsh, 1862, *Proc. entomol. Soc. Philadelphia,* vol. 1, p. 301
CALAPHIDINI Oestlund, 1918, *Rep. Minn. St. Entomol.,* vol. 18, p. 64
Calaphis Walsh, 1862, *Proc. entomol. Soc. Philadelphia,* vol. 1, p. 301
CALLAPHIDINAE Börner, 1952. *Mitt. thüring. bot. Ver.,* Beiheft, 3, p. 32
Callaphis Walker, 1870, *The Zoologist,* vol. 5, p. 2000
juglandis, Aphis, Goeze, 1778, *Ent. Beyträge,* vol. 2, p. 311
Panaphis Kirkaldy, 1904, *Entomologist,* vol. 37, p. 279.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)25 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1358.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
2 August 1985

OPINION 1359
UROPLAT- AS THE STEM OF FAMILY-GROUP NAMES IN REPTILIA, SAURIA AND INSECTA, COLEOPTERA: A RULING TO REMOVE THE HOMONYMY

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, the stem of the generic name *Uroplatus* Duméril, 1806 (Sauria) for the purposes of Article 29 is hereby ruled to be UROPLATI-.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Uroplatus* Duméril, 1806 (Sauria) (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Stellio fimbriatus* Schneider, 1792 (Name Number 1359);
(b) *Uroplata* Chevrolat, 1835 (Coleoptera) (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by White, 1981, *Hispa mucronata* Olivier, 1808 (Name Number 2296).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *fimbriatus* Schneider, 1792, as published in the binomen *Stellio fimbriatus* (specific name of the type species of *Uroplatus* Duméril, 1806) (Name Number 3030);
(b) *mucronata* Olivier, 1808, as published in the binomen *Hispa mucronata* (specific name of the type species of *Uroplata* Chevrolat, 1935) (Name Number 3031).

(4) The following family-group names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) UROPLATIIDAE Boulenger, 1884 (emended through the ruling under the plenary powers in (1) above from UROPLATIDAE) (type genus *Uroplatus* Duméril, 1806) (Sauria) (Name Number 593);
(b) UROPLATINI Leng, 1920 (type genus *Uroplata* Chevrolat, 1835) (Coleoptera) (Name Number 594).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2373

An application for the use of the plenary powers to remove the homonymy involving the use of UROPLAT- as the stem of family-group names in the Sauria and Coleoptera was first received from Professor H. M. Smith (*Department of Environmental, Population and Organismic Biology, University of Colorado, U.S.A.*), Dr U. N. Lanham (*University of Colorado Museum*) and the late Dr A. Loveridge on 10 January 1980. After some correspondence, a revised draft was sent to the printers on 14 January 1983 and published on 29 March 1983 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 40, pp. 62–64. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general, three herpetological and eight entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 April 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)26 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, pp. 62–63. At the close of the voting period on 15 July 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Holthuis, Halvorsen, Binder, Savage, Gruchy, Trjapitzin, Mroczkowski, Corliss, Lehtinen, Ride, Alvarado, Willink, Schuster, Uéno, Brinck, Kraus, Bayer, Heppell, Bernardi

Negative Votes — two (2) Hahn, Dupuis.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Cogger and Starobogatov.

The following comments were returned by Members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'Let us hope that no one comes up with a genus *Uroplatius* or *Uroplatia*.'

Hahn: 'I disagree on two points: (1) The stem of *Uroplatus* may be changed into "UROPLATU-" (UROPLATUIDAE, as SCUTELLUIDAE), but not into "UROPLATI-" — there is no "i" in this word! (2) The authors do not state why the older and not the younger name should be modified. Why not Uroplataini for the tribe of Coleoptera?'

Dupuis: 'Il fallait faire exactement l'inverse (la requête n'examine même pas cette possibilité):

—UROPLATIDAE à conserver pour les Reptiles, comme étant 1°) le plus connu; 2° fondé sur le nom de genre le plus ancien; 3°) proposé au niveau supergénérique le plus élevé; 4°) proposé en 1884.

—UROPLATIINI à introduire sous forme modifiée pour les *Hispinae* comme étant: 1°) le moins connu; 2°) fondé sur le nom de genre le plus récent; 3°) proposé au niveau supergénérique le moins élevé; 4°) proposé en 1920.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

fimbriatus, Stellio, Schneider, 1792, *Amphibiorum physiologiae specimen alterum,* p. 32

mucronata, Hispa, Olivier, 1808, *Entomologie, ou histoire naturelle des insectes* . . . vol. 6, Coléoptères, p. 765

Uroplata Chevrolat *in* Dejean, 1834, *Catalogue des coléoptères de la collection de M. le comte Dejean,* p. 365

UROPLATIIDAE Boulenger, 1884, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.,* (5), vol. 14, p. 119

UROPLATINI Leng, 1920, *Catalogue of the Coleoptera of America, north of Mexico*, p. 303

Uroplatus Duméril, 1806, *Zoologie analytique, ou méthode naturelle de classification des animaux*, p. 80.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)26 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1359.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
5 August 1985

OPINION 1360

OECIACUS VICARIUS HORVÁTH, 1912 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *lunifrontis* Cooper, 1870, as published in the binomen *Cimex lunifrontis,* is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;

(2) The specific name *vicarius* Horváth, 1912, as published in the binomen *Oeciacus vicarius,* is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3032.

(3) The specific name *lunifrontis* Cooper, 1870, as published in the binomen *Cimex lunifrontis,* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2172.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2358

An application for the use of the plenary powers to conserve the specific name *Oeciacus vicarius* Horváth, 1912 was first received from Dr R. C. Froeschner (*National Museum of Natural History, Washington, U.S.A.*), Dr E. V. Coan (*California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, U.S.A.*) and Dr R. E. Ryckman (*Loma Linda University, California, U.S.A.*) on 27 August 1980. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 30 November 1982 and published on 29 March 1982 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 40, pp. 65–66. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and eight entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 April 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)27 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, p. 66. At the close of the voting period on 15 July 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-three (23) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Holthuis, Halvorsen, Binder, Savage, Gruchy, Trjapitzin, Mroczkowski, Corliss, Lehtinen, Ride, Alvarado, Willink, Hahn, Schuster, Uéno, Brinck, Dupuis, Kraus, Bayer, Heppell, Bernardi

Negative Votes — none (0).

Late affirmative votes were returned by Cogger and Starobogatov.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index:

lunifrontis, Cimex, Cooper, 1870 *in* Baird, S. F., *Ornithology, Vol. 1 Land Birds,* pp. 105–106

vicarius, Oeciacus, Horváth, 1912, *Ann. Mus. nat. Hist. Hungary,* vol. 10, p. 261.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)27 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1360.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
7 August 1985

OPINION 1361
LARENTIA CAPITATA HERRICH-SCHÄFFER, 1839, GIVEN NOMENCLATURAL PRECEDENCE OVER *PHALAENA POSTICATA* FABRICIUS, 1794 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, it is hereby ruled that the specific name *capitata* Herrich-Schäffer, 1839, as published in the binomen *Larentia capitata*, is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the specific name *posticata* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Phalaena posticata*, whenever the two names are considered synonyms.

(2) The specific name *capitata* Herrich-Schäffer, 1839, as published in the binomen *Larentia capitata*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3033 and with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over *posticata* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Phalaena posticata*, whenever the two names are considered synonyms.

(3) The specific name *posticata* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Phalaena posticata*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3034 and with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *capitata* Herrich-Schäffer, 1839, as published in the binomen *Larentia capitata*, whenever the two names are considered synonyms.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2367

An application for the use of the relative precedence procedure to conserve the specific name *Larentia capitata* Herrich-Schäffer, 1839 was first received from Dr K. Mikkola (*University of Helsinki, Finland*) on 1 December 1980 (see also Opinion 1362). After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printer on 30 November 1982 and published on 15 July 1983 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 40, pp. 102–105. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and nine entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 April 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)28 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, pp. 103–104, (1)a, (2)a and (2)b. At the close of the voting period on 15 July 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-two (22) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Holthuis, Halvorsen, Binder, Savage, Trjapitzin, Mroczkowski, Corliss, Lehtinen, Alvarado, Willink, Hahn, Schuster, Gruchy, Uéno, Brinck, Dupuis, Kraus, Bayer, Heppell, Bernardi

Negative Votes — one (1) Ride.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Cogger and Starobogatov.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Dupuis: '[I vote for] sous réserve de l'exhaustivité bibliographique et de l'exactitude taxonomique de la requête.'

Ride: 'The author establishes a prima facia case that stability and universality would be upset by the use of the senior synonym but makes no case for the use of the plenary powers to reverse precedence. The application must fail. The Commission can only use the plenary powers when there is a demonstration that there is a threat to stability or universality or that confusion is likely to result.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

capitata, Larentia, Herrich-Schäffer, 1839, *Deutschlands Insekten,* Heft 165, pl. 3

posticata, Phalaena, Fabricius, 1794, *Entomologia systematica,* vol. 3(2), p. 196.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)28 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the Interntional Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1361.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
7 August 1985

OPINION 1362

PHALAENA CORACINA ESPER, 1805, GIVEN NOMENCLATURAL PRECEDENCE OVER *PHALAENA HIRTATA* FABRICIUS, 1794 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers, it is hereby ruled that the specific name *coracina* Esper 1805, as published in the binomen *Phalaena coracina,* is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the specific name *hirtata* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Phalaena hirtata,* whenever the two names are considered synonyms.

(2) The specific name *coracina* Esper 1805, as published in the binomen *Phalaena coracina,* is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3035 and with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over *hirtata* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Phalaena hirtata,* whenever the two names are considered synonyms.

(3) The specific name *hirtata* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Phalaena hirtata,* is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3036 and with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *coracina* Esper, 1805, as published in the binomen *Phalaena coracina,* whenever the two names are considered synonyms.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2367

An application for the use of relative precedence procedure to conserve the specific name *Phalaena coracina* Esper, 1805 was first received from Dr K. Mikkola (*University of Helsinki, Finland*) on 1 December 1980 (see also Opinion 1361). After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printer on 30 November 1982 and published on 15 July 1983 in *Bull. zool. Nom.,* vol. 40, pp. 102–105. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and nine entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 April 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)29 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, pp. 103–104, (1)b, (2)c and (2)d. At the close of the voting period on 15 July 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Holthuis, Halvorsen, Binder, Trjapitzin, Mroczkowski, Corliss, Lehtinen, Alvarado, Willink, Hahn, Schuster, Gruchy, Uéno, Brinck, Dupuis, Kraus, Bayer, Heppell, Bernardi

Negative Votes — two (2) Savage, Ride.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Cogger and Starobogatov.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Dupuis: [I vote for] sous réserve de l'exhaustivité bibliographique et de l'exactitude taxonomique de la requête.'

Ride: 'The author establishes a prima facia case that stability and universality would be upset by the use of the senior synonym but makes no case for the use of the plenary powers to reverse precedence. The application must fail. The Commission can only use the plenary powers when there is a demonstration that there is a threat to stability or universality or that confusion is likely to result.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

coracina, Phalaena, Esper, 1805, *Die europäischen Schmetterlinge in Abbildungen nach der Natur mit Beschreibungen,* teil 4, Abschn. 2, p. 74

hirtata, Phalaena, Fabricius, 1794, *Entomologia systematica,* vol. 3(2), p. 181.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)29 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1362.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
8 August 1985

OPINION 1363
ANCISTROCEROIDES SAUSSURE, 1855 (INSECTA, HYMENOPTERA): TYPE SPECIES DESIGNATED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers all type species designations hitherto made for the nominal genus *Ancistroceroides* Saussure, 1855 are hereby set aside and *Odynerus alastoroides* Saussure, 1853 is hereby designated as type species of that genus.

(2) Entry No. 1857 in the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology is hereby corrected to read: *Ancistroceroides* Saussure, 1855 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers, *Odynerus alastoroides* Saussure, 1853.

(3) The specific name *alastoroides* Saussure, 1853, as published in the binomen *Odynerus alastoroides* (specific name of the type species of *Ancistroceroides* Saussure, 1855) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3037.

(4) The word 'formerly' is hereby inserted before the words '(type species of *Ancistroceroides* Saussure, 1855)' in the entry under Name Number 2330 in the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2280

An application for the use of the plenary powers to designate a type species for *Ancistroceroides* Saussure, 1855, was first received from Professor J. van der Vecht (*Burg Vermeerlaan 4, 3881 GZ Putten, The Netherlands*) on 11 September 1978. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 19 April 1983 and published on 15 July 1983 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 40, pp. 111–113. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and nine entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 April 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)31 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, pp. 112–113. At the close of the voting period on 15 July 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Holthuis, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Mroczkowski, Corliss, Lehtinen, Ride, Binder, Alvarado, Willink, Uéno, Brinck, Dupuis, Kraus, Bayer, Heppell, Bernardi

Negative Votes — three (3) received in the following order: Savage, Hahn, Schuster.

Late affirmative votes were returned from Cogger and Starobogatov.

No vote was returned by Gruchy.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Hahn: 'I think it would be better to give precedence to *Paralastor* over *Ancistroceroides*, if they are thought to be synonyms, and to leave the type species untouched.'

Kraus: 'Unfortunately, no comment has been received by any hymenopterologist. The reasons presented in the application are in part based on subjective taxonomic judgement. With regard to this aspect, and with regard to the fact that the Commission had been asked in 1967 to accept the designation of a type species for the genus *Ancistroceroides* Saussure, 1855, which was practically a *nomen dubium* at the time, I have difficulty voting in favour of the present proposal. It seems that the name *Paralastor* Saussure, 1855 has been widely used and thus should be retained.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCE

The following is the original reference for the name placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

alastoroides, Odynerus, Saussure, 1853, *Monographie des guêpes solitaires ou de la tribu des Euméniens, pp. 129–286*, p. 147.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)31 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decisions so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1363.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
12 August 1985

OPINION 1364
KASSINA GIRARD, 1853 (AMPHIBIA, ANURA): CONSERVED
(see Opinion 849)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the generic name *Eremiophilus* Fitzinger, 1843, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The generic name *Hylambates* Duméril, 1853 (gender: masculine), type species, by monotypy, *Hylambates maculatus* Duméril, 1853, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with an endorsement that it is not to be given precedence over *Kassina* Girard, 1853, whenever the two names are considered synonyms (Name Number 2297).

(3) The specific name *maculatus* Duméril, 1853, as published in the binomen *Hylambates maculatus* (specific name of the type species of *Hylambates* Duméril, 1953) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3038.

(4) The generic name *Eremiophilus* Fitzinger, 1843, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2173.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2343

An application for the conservation of *Kassina* Girard, 1853, was first received from Dr A. Dubois and Dr J. J. Morère (*Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, France*) and Mr A. F. Stimpson and Mr B. T. Clarke (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) on 22 April 1980. After some correspondence, a revised draft was sent to the printers on 19 April 1983 and published on 15 July 1983 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 40, pp. 114–116. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and three herpetological serials. A supportive comment was received from Dr H. M. Smith (*University of Colorado, U.S.A.*). No adverse comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 April 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)32 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, pp. 114–115. At the close of the voting period on 15 July 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-three (23) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Holthuis, Halvorsen, Binder, Savage, Gruchy, Trjapitzin, Mroczkowski, Corliss, Lehtinen, Ride, Alvarado, Willink, Hahn, Schuster, Uéno, Brinck, Dupuis, Kraus, Bayer, Heppell, Bernardi

Negative Votes — none (0).

Late affirmative votes were returned by Cogger and Starobogatov.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Eremiophilus Fitzinger, 1843, *Systema Reptilium*, p. 32
Hylambates Duméril, 1853, *Annls. Sci. nat. (Zool.)*, vol. 19, p. 162
maculatus Duméril, 1853, *ibid.*, p. 165.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)32 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1364.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
12 August 1985

OPINION 1365

ALLYGUS FIEBER, 1872 (INSECTA, HOMOPTERA): TYPE SPECIES DESIGNATED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Allygus* Fieber, 1872, prior to the designation by Van Duzee, 1917, of *Cicada mixta* Fabricius, 1794 as type species of that genus, are hereby set aside.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *Allygus* Fieber, 1872 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Van Duzee, 1917 and as ratified under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Cicada mixta* Fabricius, 1794 (Name Number 2298);

(b) *Allygidius* Ribaut, 1948 (gender: masculine), type species, by original designation, *Cicada atomaria* Fabricius, 1794 (Name Number 2299)

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

(a) *mixta* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Cicada mixta* (specific name of the type species of *Allygus* Fieber, 1872) (Name Number 3039);

(b) *atomaria* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Cicada atomaria* (specific name of the type species of *Allygidius* Ribaut, 1948) (Name Number 3040).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2431

An application for the use of the plenary powers to designate a type species for *Allygus* Fieber, 1872 was first received from Dr F. Ossiannilsson (*Källparksgatan, Uppsala, Sweden*) on 13 December 1982. After some correspondence, a revised draft was sent to the printers on 19 April 1983 and published on 15 July 1983 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol 40, pp. 119–121. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and nine entomological serials. Several supportive comments were received prior to publication and these are listed with the application. No comment after publication was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 April 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)34 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, p. 120. At the close of the voting period on 15 July 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Holthuis, Halvorsen, Savage, Trjapitzin, Mroczkowski, Corliss, Lehtinen, Ride, Binder, Alvarado, Willink, Hahn, Schuster, Uéno, Brinck, Dupuis, Bayer, Heppell, Bernardi

Negative Votes — one (1) Kraus.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Cogger and Starobogatov.

No vote was returned by Gruchy.

Professor Binder asked the following questions:

'Que s'est-il passé entre Van Duzee, 1917 et Ribaut?' Sur quoi repose l'affirmation *"Syringius* ... is congeneric with *Allygus* if *Cicada mixta* Fabricius, 1794 is its type species"?' [On the receipt of a satisfactory answer to these questions from Dr Ossiannilsson, Professor Binder voted for the proposals.]

Kraus commented: 'I vote against the proposal as the application is only based on nomenclatural data. There is no information with regard to current usage and importance of the names in question. No comment by any specialist in Homoptera has been made.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Allygidius Ribaut, 1948, *Bull. Soc. nat. Hist. Toulouse,* vol. 83, pp. 58–59

Allygus Fieber, 1872, *Katalog der Europäischen Cicadinen, nach Originalen mit Benützung der neuesten Literatur,* p. 13

atomaria, Cicada, Fabricius, 1794, *Entomologia systematica,* vol. 4, p. 37

mixta, Cicada, Fabricius, 1794, *Entomologia systematica,* vol. 4, p. 39.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)34 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1365.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
12 August 1985

OPINION 1366

MACTRA SACHALINENSIS SCHRENK, 1862 (MOLLUSCA, BIVALVIA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *sybillae* Valenciennes, 1858, as published in the binomen *Mactra sybillae*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *sachalinensis* Schrenck, 1862, as published in the binomen *Mactra sachalinensis*, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3041.

(3) The specific name *sybillae* Valenciennes, 1858, as published in the binomen *Mactra sybillae* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1163.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2332

An application for the use of the plenary powers to conserve *Mactra sachalinensis* Schrenk, 1862 was first received from Dr A. I. Kafanov (*Far East Science Centre, Vladivostok, U.S.S.R.*) on 7 January 1980. After some correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printer on 19 April 1983 and published on 15 July 1983 in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 40, pp. 122–123. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and one specialist serial. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 15 April 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)35 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40, p. 122. At the close of the voting period on 15 July 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — eighteen (18) received in the following order: Melville, Cocks, Holthuis, Halvorsen, Savage, Trjapitzin, Binder, Corliss, Ride, Alvarado, Willink, Hahn, Schuster, Uéno, Brinck, Kraus, Bayer, Bernardi

Negative Votes — four (4) received in the following order: Mroczkowski, Lehtinen, Dupuis, Heppell.

Late affirmative votes were returned by Cogger and Starobogatov.

No vote was returned by Gruchy.

The following comments were returned by Commissioners with their voting papers:

Uéno: 'I would have voted against this proposal if the species in question had had no economic importance.'

Mroczkowski: 'As both the names (*sachalinensis* and *sybillae*) are only subjective synonyms, the relative precedence procedure should be adopted in this case.'

Lehtinen: 'The list of references is by no means convincing. A few authors from two countries have used the name *Mactra sachalinensis* Schrenk, 1862, during a relatively short period. The first serious attempt to get more information for this species in main collections of Mollusca resulted in the discovery of a senior synonym — nobody knows how many there might be when this group is critically revised also using material and literature dealing with neighbouring areas.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

sachalinensis, Mactra, Schrenk, 1862, *Bull. Acad. imp. Sci. St. Pétersbourg,* vol. 4, p. 412

sybillae, Mactra, Valenciennes, 1858, *C.r. Acad. Sci.,* vol. 46, p. 760.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)35 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1366.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
13 August 1985

OPINION 1367
ALPHEUS LOTTINI GUERIN, 1829 (CRUSTACEA, DECAPODA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers the specific name *sublucanus* Forskål, 1775, as published in the binomen *Cancer sublucanus,* is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy.

(2) The specific name *lottini* Guérin, 1829, as published in the binomen *Alpheus lottini,* is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 3042.

(3) The specific name *sublucanus* Forskål, 1775, as published in the binomen *Cancer sublucanus* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1164.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2370

An application for the use of the plenary powers to conserve *Alpheus lottini* Guérin, 1829 was first received from the late Dr A. H. Banner and Mrs D. M. Banner (*University of Hawaii at Manoa, U.S.A.*) on 19 January 1981. After some correspondence it was sent to the printer on 15 September 1981 and published simultaneously with a comment from Dr L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden*) on 8 December 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.,* vol. 38, pp. 297–304. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and three specialist serials. No comment was received.

Subsequent correspondence between Dr Holthuis, Dr & Mrs Banner and the Secretary, resulted in revised proposals for conservation being put forward by Dr & Mrs Banner. These were published on 7 December 1982 in *Bull. zool. Nom.,* vol. 39, pp. 286–287. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, seven general and four specialist serials. No comment was received.

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)43 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.,* vol. 39, pp. 286–287. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was 11 positive votes and 8 negative with 6 voting papers not returned. The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Hahn: 'As is shown by Dr Holthuis in his comment, none of the four names used has definitely won prominence. Therefore it would be best to use the oldest name, *C. sublucanus.*'

Bayer: 'In this case I think it is best to let priority rule, as the nomenclature is a jumble and there is no strongly prevalent usage to be protected. Since there seems to be little doubt that *Cancer sublucanus* Forskål = *Alpheus lottini* Guérin, Forskål's very old specific name will prevail. If *lottini* does prove to be specifically distinct, its name is available for use.'

Heppell: 'I consider the revised proposals the worst of all the possible alternatives. I accept Holthuis's argument for encouraging Forsskål's name *sublucanus* to come into general usage. No action contrary to the Code is necessary and the name *lottini* would remain available for use in the event that some authors might subsequently consider it to be taxonomically distinct. (Similarly if the senior name had been maintained in Opinion 846 the junior name would have remained available for use for the segregate taxon.) If the revised proposals are accepted, it will always be uncertain in future, whenever an author uses the name *sublucanus*, whether he is intending a taxon distinct from *lottini* or whether he has overlooked or ignored the Commission's ruling. I believe the device of artificially inverting precedence should be reserved for use in exceptional cases, whereas the Commission now seems to advocate its use in case after case as a means of sitting on the nomenclatural fence.'

The above comments were sent to Dr and Mrs Banner and to Dr Holthuis. The Banners replied with an in depth analysis of the relative usage of both *sublucanus* and *lottini* from 1958 to the present. Their analysis showed that *A. lottini* had enjoyed about eight times as much usage as *A. sublucanus* — 81·2% of the 48 citations quoted since 1958. They concluded that: (a) all meticulous carcinologists have consistently used the name *lottini* for almost 30 years; (b) some of the works published using *lottini* will become standard faunal references for all biologists working in various regions of the Indo-Pacific for years to come; (c) the name *sublucanus*, a nomen oblitum, was introduced in 1971, contrary to the then current rules of zoological nomenclature; (d) since the rationale for the revival of the ancient name was first explained in 1979, only two responsible carcinologists, Drs Holthuis and Miya, have used the name in a total of three personally authored publications. These conclusions, along with a detailed report by the Secretary reviewing the history of the case, was sent to all Commissioners with a voting paper issued under Byelaw 35. The two alternatives offered in this voting paper were: A. Refusal to use the plenary powers; application of the Principle of Priority; placing of *C. sublucanus* on the Official List, or, B. Application of the first part of Article 79b(iii); suppression of *C. sublucanus* for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy; placing of *A. lottini* on the Official List.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 30 April 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1985)36, issued under Byelaw 35, for or against the two mutually exclusive alternatives previously outlined. At the close of the voting period on 30 July 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Alternative A

Affirmative votes — six (6) received in the following order: Mroczkowski, Lehtinen, Willink, Brinck, Bernardi, Heppell.

Alternative B

Affirmative votes — twelve (12) received in the following order: Melville, Kraus, Savage, Binder, Halvorsen, Corliss, Ride, Cocks, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Uéno, Schuster.

Holthuis abstained. Late affirmative votes for alternative A were received from Cogger and Starobogatov. No votes were returned by Alvarado, Bayer, Dupuis and Gruchy.

The following comments were returned by Commissioners with their voting papers:

Bernardi: 'Je ne suis pas partisan de suspendre le Principe de priorité sauf dans des cas exceptionnels (animaux à grande importance économique ou classiques en zoologie générale). Si l'on trouve que l'emploi de *sublucanus* Forskål peut prêter à confusion il suffit d'écrire: *sublucanus* Forskål = *lottini* Guérin, c'est-à-dire de citer la synonymie.'

Heppell: 'After re-considering all the statements concerning this case I maintain my original conclusion that *Alpheus sublucanus* Forskål should be the valid name for the species more often known as *A. lottini*. Although there is no doubt a preponderance of usage of the latter name this is far from a situation of stability. In my opinion there is insufficient cause to set aside priority in this case.

'I should like the opportunity to dispel any misunderstanding that may have arisen from my previous comment. As I understand Article 79, its whole point is to define and delimit the circumstances in which the normal provisions of the Code may be suspended. My statement that "No action contrary to the Code is necessary" [to make *A. sublucanus* the valid name] simply meant that to achieve this result the normal provisions [i.e. Articles 1–75] of the Code did not need to be set aside by use of plenary power. I had thought this was self-evident and had certainly not meant to imply that the possible use of the plenary power to accord *A. lottini* precedence over *A. sublucanus* would be action contrary to the Code in the sense which the Secretary has chosen to read into my words.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

lottini, Alpheus, Guérin, [1829], *Voyage autour du Monde ... sur ... La Coquille, pendant ... 1822–1825, Zoologie, vol. 2(2)*, p. 38, pl. 3

sublucanus, Cancer, Forskål, 1775, *Descriptiones animalium, avium, amphibiorum, piscium, insectorum, vermium, quae in itinere orientali, observavit,* p. 94.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (85)36 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1367.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
14 August 1985

OPINION 1368
THE GENERIC NAMES *PAN* AND *PANTHERA* (MAMMALIA, CARNIVORA): AVAILABLE AS FROM OKEN, 1816

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers:
(a) It is hereby ruled that the names *Pan* and *Panthera* are generic names and available as from Oken, 1816;
(b) all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genera *Pan* Oken, 1816 and *Panthera* Oken, 1816 are hereby set aside and *Simia troglodytes* Blumenbach, 1779 and *Felis pardus* Linnaeus, 1758 are hereby designated as type species of *Pan* Oken, 1816 and *Panthera* Oken, 1816 respectively.

(2) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:
(a) *Pan* Oken, 1816 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above, *Simia troglodytes* Blumenbach, 1779 (Name Number 2300);
(b) *Panthera* Oken, 1816 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) (b) above, *Felis pardus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Name Number 2301).

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:
(a) *troglodytes* Blumenbach, 1779, as published in the binomen *Simia troglodytes* (specific name of the type species of *Pan* Oken, 1816) (Name Number 3043);
(b) *pardus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Felis pardus* (specific name of the type species of *Panthera* Oken, 1816) (Name Number 3044).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)482

The question of the status of the names in Oken, 1816, *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte,* was first brought to the attention of the Commission as early as 1944 by the late Dr W. H. Osgood of the Chicago Natural History Museum. His correspondence, along with that from other zoologists and a report from Mr F. Hemming (then Secretary of the Commission), was published in *Bull. zool. Nom.* (hereafter referred to as BZN), vol. 9, pp. 193–218 (May 1954). This resulted in Opinion 417 (*Ops. Decl. Int. Comm. zool. Nomencl.,* vol. 14, pp. 1–42, 1956) which, although rejecting volume 3 (Zoologie) of Oken's *Lehrbuch* for nomenclatural purposes, invited zoologists to apply for the conservation of names, which, in the interests of stability, should be accepted as from that work and date.

After the publication of Opinion 417 there was little or no correspondence regarding the names in Oken's *Lehrbuch* until an application from Sir Terence Morrison-Scott (formerly Keeper of Zoology and Director, British Museum (Natural History), London) for the conservation of the names *Pan* and *Panthera* as from Oken, 1816, was received on 26 August 1965. This was itself a revised version of an earlier draft submitted to the Commission (though never published) on 23 September 1950 asking for five of Oken's mammal names to be conserved in the event of the *Lehrbuch* being rejected by the Commission.

The later Morrison-Scott application was sent to the printer on 9 September 1965 and published on 2 November 1965 in BZN, vol. 22, pp. 230–232. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and two mammalogical serials. Comments were received from a variety of sources generally supporting the proposals of Morrison-Scott. Dr S. P. Hershkovitz (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Illinois, U.S.A.*) opposed the proposals and preferred the conservation of *Chimpansee* Voigt, 1831 and *Leo* Brehm, 1829 instead of *Pan* and *Panthera*. His comment was published in BZN, vol. 23, pp. 67–69 along with another comment opposing the proposals from Dr F. Dias de Avila-Pires (*Museu Nacional, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil*). Further comments by Professor E. Tortonese (*Museum of Natural History, Genoa, Italy*), Professor E. Mayr (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard, U.S.A.*), Dr H. Hemmer (*Institut für physiologische Zoologie, University of Mainz, BRD.*), Dr V. Mazak (*MNHN, France and Institut of Systematic Zoology, Prague, CSSR*) and Dr P. Leyhausen (*Max-Planck-Institute für Verhaltenphysiologie, Wuppertal, BRD*) were received and published in BZN, vol. 24, p. 3; vol. 24, p. 66; vol. 24, pp. 259–261; vol. 25, pp. 66–67 and vol. 25, p. 130 respectively. A reply to Dr Mayr's comment by Dr Hershkovitz was published in vol. 24, pp. 261–262. Due to the many collateral issues raised in these comments, voting on the original proposals was deferred.

A second application by Dr G. B. Corbet, Mr J. E. Hill, Mrs J. M. Ingles and Dr P. H. Napier (*Department of Zoology, British Museum (Natural History), London*) was received on 16 November 1973. This incorporated the original proposals of Morrison-Scott plus all the published comments. It was sent to the printers on 14 January 1974 and published in BZN, vol. 31, pp. 29–42. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general and two mammalogical serials.

Comments were received from Dr C. P. Groves (*Australian National University, Canberra, Australia*) and Dr P. Leyhausen (*Max-Planck-Institut*). These were published along with a comment from Dr R. G. van Gelder (*American Museum of Natural History, New York, U.S.A*) offering revised proposals, in BZN, vol. 32, pp. 68–73. A reply to van Gelder from Corbet *et al.* was published in the same place. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the revised proposals by van Gelder was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, and two mammalogical serials.

A further comment was received from Dr S. P. Hershkovitz and published in conjunction with a reply from Corbet *et al.* in BZN, vol. 33, pp. 135–136.

On 7 April 1978 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on V.P. (1978) 1 for or against two mutually exclusive alternatives. The first involved validating *Pan* Oken, 1816, *Panthera* Oken, 1816 and *Tigris* Oken, 1816. The second involved designating *Felis leo* Linnaeus, 1758 as type species of the nominal genus *Leo* Brehm with the suppression of *Theranthropus* Brookes, 1828 and placing *Chimpansee* Voigt, 1831 and *Leo* Brehm, 1829, along with their relevant type species, on the Official Lists with the placement of *Pan* Oken, 1816, *Panthera* Oken, 1816 and *Theranthropus* Brookes, 1828 on the Official Index. The vote in favour of the former was 14 to 3. However, during the voting period comments were received from Mr D. Heppell and Dr W. D. L. Ride who both pointed out that the voting paper did not give the opportunity to consider the alternative proposals put forward by Dr Hershkovitz in BZN, vol. 33, pp. 135–136, who, contrary to his earlier views, held that *Pan* could be taken from Palmer, 1904 and *Panthera* from Severtzow, 1858.

As a consequence of these and other comments as well as the internally inconsistent result of the vote on V.P. (78) 1 the matter was referred to Council on 5 December 1978. Unfortunately, the Council was itself divided as to the best means of approaching the problem and there followed a long series of exchanges between the Council members as to the various options open to the Commission for voting.

The matters raised by Dr Ride and Mr Heppell in their voting papers were, in part, then under consideration by the Commission in connection with the 3rd edition of the Code (i.e. the status of names in works rejected for nomenclatural purposes and the status of names for divisions and subdivisions of genera). These matters are now clarified under Articles 78h and 10e.

At a meeting of the Council at the British Museum (Natural History), London on 11 October 1984, Dr Ride again raised the question of *Pan* and *Panthera*. It was proposed that these two names should be validated (i.e. made available) as from Oken, 1816, as soon as possible.

After publication of the 3rd edition of the Code in February 1985 the status of the case was examined jointly by Dr Ride and Mr Melville. A detailed report was prepared summarising the entire history of the case along with explanations of the consequences of voting for the particular options available to the Commission. A One–Month voting paper was also prepared for issue under Byelaw 33.

The choice now placed before the Commission (given that *Pan* and *Panthera* were validated from Oken 1816 as a result of the 14 to 3 majority in V.P. (78) 1) was one of three alternatives. Alternative A was to confirm the decision reached in 1978 and complete it by designating *Homo* *troglodytes* Linnaeus, 1758 as type species of *Pan* Oken, 1816 and *Felis pardus* Linnaeus, 1758 as type species of *Panthera* Oken, 1816.

Alternative B(i) proposed conservation of *Pan* Palmer, 1904 and *Panthera* Severtzow, 1858 by the suppression of *Chimpansee* Voigt, 1831 and all uses of *Pan* prior to Palmer, 1904 (Dr Hershkovitz's revised proposals of 1976). This alternative further entailed suppression of *Leo* Brehm and *Tigris* Gray, 1843 for priority and *Panthera* Hübner, 1823 (an unused generic name in the Lepidoptera) for priority and homonymy.

Alternative B(ii) was to give *Panthera* Severtzow, 1858 precedence over *Leo Brehm,* 1829 and *Tigris* Gray, 1843.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 7 August 1985 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the One–Month Rule on Voting Paper (O.M.) (1985) 1, for or against the alternatives outlined. At the close of the voting period on 7 September 1985 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative votes—Alternative A—nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Ride, Binder, Holthuis, Cocks, Uéno, Kraus, Halvorsen, Bayer, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Alvarado, Gruchy, Heppell, Corliss, Schuster, Cogger, Savage, Bernardi

Negative Votes—Alternative A—two (2) Starobogatov, Trjapitzin.

Affirmative Votes—Alternative B(i)—none (0).

Negative Votes—Alternative B(i)—twenty-one (21) received in the following order: Melville, Ride, Binder, Holthuis, Cocks, Uéno, Kraus, Halvorsen, Bayer, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Alvarado, Gruchy, Heppell, Corliss, Starobogatov, Trjapitzin, Schuster, Cogger, Savage, Bernardi

Affirmative Votes—Alternative B(ii)—two (2): Starobogatov, Trjapitzin.

Negative Votes—Alternative B(ii)—nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Ride, Binder, Holthuis, Cocks, Uéno, Kraus, Halvorsen, Bayer, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Alvarado, Gruchy, Heppell, Corliss, Schuster, Cogger, Savage, Bernardi.

No votes were returned by Brinck, Dupuis, Willink and Lehtinen.

Holthuis commented: '*Homo troglodytes* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Systema Naturae,* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 24) describes a white tropical being ('Corpus album. . .') which may be an albino negro or Malay. This is also shown by the reference to 'Kakurlacko'. In the colonial slang of the day, the word 'kakkerlak' or 'witte kakkerlak' (=cockroach or white cockroach) was used in the East Indies to indicate someone who looked European but had some (or much) native Malay blood. Linnaeus' reference to Bontius, 1658 (in W. Piso, *De Indiae utriusque re naturali et medica,* pt. 3, pp. 1–160) is to Bontius' (p. 84) description and figure of 'Orang Outang sive Homo silvestris'. Although Bontius' figure is rather crude and looks more like a hairy lady than an Orang Utan, his description is almost certainly based (at least partly) on the ape. Among authors there is some difference of opinion on what Brontius' animal represents, but most consider it an orang utan. Anyhow Linnaeus' *Homo troglodytes* is based on a mixture of human beings and the orang utan, but certainly not on the chimpanzee. The name *troglodytes* as used at present for the chimpanzee is based on *Simia troglodytes* Blumenbach, 1779 (*Handbuch der Naturgeschichte*, p. 65). Blumenbach's description and literature references leave not the slightest doubt that he described the chimpanzee (he also cited the vernacular name Chimpanse for it). That he did not just place *Homo troglodytes* L. in the genus *Simia* is shown by his remark on the previous page (p. 64): 'Linne's Homo troglodytes ist ein Gemisch aus der Geschichte dieser presshaften waren Menschen [which he defined a few lines previously as 'Die Kackerlacken, Blasards, Albinos oder, weisse Mohren sind nicht einmal eine Spielart, geschweige eine besondere Gattung'], und des Orangutangs'.

'There is no good reason not to consider *Simia troglodytes* Blumenbach, 1779 a good species and it should be used as the type of *Pan*, not *Homo troglodytes* L.'

'*Troglodytes niger* Geoffroy, 1812 (*Ann. Mus. Hist. nat. Paris*, vol. 19, p. 87) is an unnecessary name, but it is not a replacement name for *Homo troglodytes* L. It is a new name in the synonymy of which Geoffroy cited '*Simia troglodytes* Linn., 12, 1 [evidently meaning 12th edition of *Systema Naturae* (should be 13th) first species of *Simia*] '*Simia pygmaeus* Screb fig. 1, B' (=Schreber, Die Säugethiere) and *Simia satyrus* Schreb., fig. 2 (same work). Actually *Homo troglodytes* L. is not mentioned by Geoffroy, and all his references are to recognizable descriptions and figures of the chimpanzee'.

'My vote for Alternative A is on the condition that *Simia troglodytes* Blumenbach, 1779 and not *Homo troglodytes* L. be made the type of the genus *Pan* Oken, 1816'. [This comment was circulated to Council who approved the designation of *Simia troglodytes* Blumenbach, 1779 as type species of *Pan* Oken, 1816 and this is incorporated in the present ruling.]

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

Pan Oken, 1816 *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*, vol. 3 (Zoologie), p. 1230
Panthera Oken, 1816, *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*, vol. 3, (Zoologie), p. 1052
pardus, Felis, Linnaeus, 1758, *Systema Naturae*, ed. 10, p. 41–42
troglodytes, Simia, Blumenbach, 1779, *Handbuch der Naturgeschichte*, p. 65.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Papers (78)1 and (O.M.) (85)1 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in those voting papers have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decisions so taken, being the decisions of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, are truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1368.

P. K. TUBBS
Executive Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
7 October 1985

SEMIONOTUS AGASSIZ, 1832 (OSTEICHTHYES): PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF *SEMIONOTUS BERGERI* AGASSIZ, 1833 AS TYPE SPECIES. Z.N.(S.)2434

By Amy R. McCune (*Section of Ecology & Systematics, Corson Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853-0239, U.S.A.*)

The fossil 'holostean' *Semionotus* was described by Louis Agassiz in 1832, p. 144. The only specimen of the type species ever known has been lost or destroyed. Another species, *Semionotus bergeri* has been commonly recognised as the type species for 120 years. I present the following case for designating *Semionotus bergeri* as the type species under the plenary powers.

2. Agassiz, 1836, p. 222, explicitly designated *Semionotus leptocephalus* as the type species of *Semionotus*: 'L'espèce type de ce gentre est le *Semionotus leptocephalus* du Lias de Boll [Germany]'. His description (1836, pp. 222–223) and figure (1834, Tab. 26, fig. 1) of *S. leptocephalus* were based on a single specimen from the collection of the Agricultural Society of Würtemburg at Stuttgart. It was the only example of *S. leptocephalus* known to him (Agassiz, 1836, p. 222).

3. The specimen of *S. leptocephalus*, described and figured by Agassiz, 1832, 1834, 1836, was missing as early as 1861. Fraas, 1861, who described several new species of *Semionotus*, was unable to find Agassiz's specimen of *S. leptocephalus* in the collections of the Agricultural Society. There were still no other specimens of *S. leptocephalus* known (Fraas, 1861) and apparently, other authors who had written on *Semionotus* had not seen the specimen of *S. leptocephalus* figured by Agassiz, e.g. Berger, 1843; Schauroth, 1851; Borneman, 1854. Therefore, Fraas, 1861, p. 89, suggested that the name *Semionotus* be transferred from *S. leptocephalus* to *S. bergeri*, a species from the late Triassic of Coburg, Germany. This action was acknowledged by Deecke, 1889, applauded by Schellwien, 1901 and followed without qualification by Woodward, 1895 and Hay, 1902.

4. The identity of *S. leptocephalus* has always been ambiguous. All specimens of *S. leptocephalus*, except the original of Agassiz, have been subsequently identified as *S. bergeri*, or as belonging to species of *Lepidotes, Pholidophorus,* or *Heterolepidotes* (Woodward, 1888; Woodward, 1895; Fraas, 1861; P. E. Olsen, pers. comm.; A. R. McCune, pers. obs.). It was noted by Agassiz, 1832, p. 223, that *S. leptocephalus* bore a marked resemblance to a young *Lepidotes minor*, and as Fraas, 1861 and Deecke, 1889, pointed out, Agassiz's figure of *S. leptocephalus* is not sufficient to distinguish it from *Lepidotes*. Indeed, the only semionotid known today from the Lias of Boll is *Lepidotes elvensis*. While Agassiz's lithograph (1834, Tab.

26, fig. 1) is not clearly distinguishable from *Lepidotes*, his working sketches of *S. leptocephalus* and *L. gigas* (= *L. elvensis*) now in the Archives de l'État de Neuchâtel, are distinguishable. His sketch of *S. leptocephalus* (Surdez, 1973, p. 125) is consistent with the concept of *Semionotus* used (cf. Larsonneur, 1964; Schaeffer & Dunkle, 1950; Eastman, 1905; Schellwien, 1901).

5. All efforts to locate Agassiz's specimens of *S. leptocephalus* have been unsuccessful. I have searched the collections of the following museums: Staaliches Museum für Naturkunde Stuttgart (which now includes the collections of the Agricultural Society of Würtemburg at Stuttgart where the specimen should have been); Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle in Paris (where Agassiz was studying when he described *S. leptocephalus*) and the Institut de Géologie de l'Université de Neuchâtel (which holds Agassiz's collection from the Académie de Neuchâtel, where he completed *Recherches sur les Poissons Fossiles*). I have also examined the collections in Tübingen, Munich, Göttingen and Zurich, and I have been informed by curators of the collections in Coburg, East Berlin and Frankfurt that they do not have the specimen. I have examined Agassiz's research notes, manuscripts and selected correspondence at the Archives de l'État in Neuchâtel and the Houghton and the Museum of Comparative Zoology libraries of Harvard University for clues or inconsistencies that might suggest the whereabouts of the specimen. I can only conclude that the specimen described as *S. leptocephalus* is permanently lost or destroyed.

6. Existing material of *S. bergeri* is adequate to serve as a reference for the genus *Semionotus*. Although Agassiz's figure of *S. bergeri* (1834, Tab. 26, fig. 2) is not informative, several syntypes exist including the figured specimen. These specimens, which I am redescribing, were referred to *Semionotus* by Agassiz, 1836, p. 224, and they are consistent with his concept of *Semionotus* as shown by his sketch of *S. leptocephalus*.

7. There are no known specimens of *S. leptocephalus*, the type species of *Semionotus*. *Semionotus bergeri* has been used as the type species for 120 years. Recognition of *S. bergeri*, rather than *S. leptocephalus*, as the type species would be in the interests of stability and universality of zoological nomenclature. Therefore I request that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(1) use its plenary powers to set aside all type designations hitherto made for the nominal genus *Semionotus* Agassiz, 1832 and to designate *Semionotus bergeri* Agassiz, 1833 as type species;
(2) place the generic name *Semionotus* Agassiz, 1832 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above *Semionotus bergeri* Agassiz, 1833, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
(3) place the specific name *bergeri* Agassiz, 1833, as published in the binomen *Semionotus bergeri* (specific name of the type species of *Semionotus* Agassiz, 1832) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

AGASSIZ, J. L. R. 1832. Untersuchungen über die fossilen Fische der Lias-Formation. *Jahrb. Mineral. Geogn. Geol. Petrefakt.* 1832, part 3, pp. 139–149.

———1834. *Recherches sur les poissons fossiles*, Livraison II. Neuchâtel: Imprimerie de Petitpierre.

———1836. *Recherches sur les poissons fossiles*, Livraison VI. Neuchâtel: Imprimerie de Petitpierre.

———1837. *Recherches sur les poissons fossiles*, Livraison VIII. Neuchâtel: Imprimerie de Petitpierre.

BERGER, H. A. C. 1843. no title [Letter on *Semionotus* and *Thalassides*, dated Coburg, 24 October 1842]. *Neues Jahrb. Mineral. Geogn. Petrefakt.* 1843, p. 86.

BORNEMANN, J. G. 1854. Ueber *Semionotus* im oberen Keupersandstein. *Z. dtsch. geol. Ges.* 1854, p. 615, Taf. 25.

COSTA, O. G. 1851. Mittelheilungen an Professor Bronn gerichtet [Letter to E. Rüppell on the fossil fishes of the kingdom of Naples.] *Neues Jahrb. Mineral. Geogn. Geol. Petrefakt.* 1851, pp. 182–184.

DEECKE, W. 1889. Ueber Fische aus verschiedenen Horizonten der Trias. *Palaeontogr.*, vol. 35, pp. 97–138.

EASTMAN, C. R. 1905. The Triassic fishes of New Jersey. *Rep. Geol. Surv. New Jersey.* 1904, pp. 67–102.

FRAAS, O. 1861. Ueber *Semionotus* und einige Keuper-Conchylien. *Jahresh. Ver. varterl. Naturk. Würtemberg*, vol. 17, pp. 81–101.

HAY, O. P. 1902. Bibliography and catalogue of fossil vertebrata. *Bull. U.S. Geol. Surv.*, vol. 179, pp. 1–868.

LARSONNEUR, C. 1964. *Semionotus normanniae* du Trias supérieur de Basse-Normandie (France). *Ann. Paléontol.*, vol. 50(2), pp. 101–117.

SCHAEFFER, B. & DUNKLE, D. 1950. A semionotid fish from the Chinle formation, with considerations of its relationships. *Am. Mus. Novit.* No. 1457, pp. 1–29.

SCHAUROTH, K. von 1851. Ueber das Vorkommen des *Semionotus bergeri* im Keuper bei Coberg. *Z. dtsch. geol. Ges.*, vol. 3, pp. 405–410.

SCHELLWIEN, E. 1901. Ueber *Semionotus* Ag. *Schr. Phys. ökon. Ges. Königsberg.*, vol. 42, pp. 1–33.

SURDEZ, M. 1973. *Catalogue des archives de Louis Agassiz.* Neuchâtel: Université de Neuchâtel, Institut de Géologie et Séminaire d'Histoire. 202 pp.

WOODWARD, A. S. 1888. Vertebrate paleontology in some continental museums. *Geol. Mag.*, dec. III, vol. 5, pp. 395–404.

———1895. *Catalogue of the fossil fishes in the British Museum.* British Museum (Natural History), 4 vols. London.

CEPHALOPHOLIS ARGUS SCHNEIDER, 1801 AND *CEPHALOPHOLIS SEXMACULATA* (RÜPPELL, 1830) (OSTEICHTHYES, SERRANIDAE): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY SUPPRESSION OF *BODIANUS GUTTATUS* BLOCH, 1790, *ANTHIUS ARGUS* BLOCH, 1792 AND *SERRANUS ZANANA* VALENCIENNES, 1828 Z.N.(S.)2470

By John E. Randall (*Bishop Museum, Box 19000-A, Honolulu, Hawaii 96817, U.S.A.*), M. L. Bauchot (*Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 43, rue Cuvier, 75231 Paris Cedex 05, France*), Adam Ben-Tuvia (*Department of Zoology, Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91904, Israel*) and Phillip C. Heemstra (*J. L. B. Smith Institute of Ichthyology, Private Bag 1015, Grahamstown 6140, South Africa*)

A. *Cephalopholis argus* Schneider, 1801

The widespread Indo-Pacific serranid fish universally known as *Cephalopholis argus* Schneider, in Bloch & Schneider, 1801, p. 311, was first described as *Perca miniata* variety b by Forskål, 1775, p. 41, from the Red Sea. The name *Perca miniata* is now restricted to the valid species *Cephalopholis miniata*. The next description was that of Bloch, 1790, p. 36, pl. 224, who named the fish *Bodianus guttatus* (spelled *gutatus* in the text and *guttatus* on the plate). The type locality was given as Japan, but this is probably an error for Java, as pointed out for a comparable example in SCARIDAE by Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1840, p. 221. Bloch's description was based on three specimens, of which only one syntype remains at the Zoologisches Museum in East Berlin (ZMB 5213, a dried skin of the right side, 231 mm SL). This was examined by the senior author.

2. The name *guttata* Bloch has not been used by authors in spite of its priority over *Cephalopholis argus* Schneider. This was probably due to the realisation that it is preoccupied by *Perca guttata* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 292, the abundant serranid fish of the tropical western Atlantic, *Epinephelus guttatus* (common name, red hind). From the time of Cuvier & Valenciennes early authors classified groupers (subfamily EPINEPHELINAE) in the genus *Serranus* Cuvier, 1817. With both *Perca guttata* and *Bodianus guttatus* in *Serranus*, the former is a senior secondary homonym of the latter. The same is true when both are classified in *Epinephelus*, as has been done by Smith, 1971, who reviewed American groupers. Most recent authors, however, recognise the genus *Cephalopholis* Schneider. *Perca guttata* Linnaeus then remains in *Epinephelus*, and *Bodianus guttatus* Bloch shifts to *Cephalopholis*, where it takes priority over *C. argus* Schneider.

3. We therefore request that the Commission suppress the name *Bodianus guttatus* Bloch so that the name *Cephalopholis argus* can be maintained. This grouper is one of the most common food fishes in the Indo-Pacific region, ranging from the Red Sea and the coast of East Africa to French Polynesia and the Pitcairn Group. It has been successfully introduced into the Hawaiian Islands. It is a distinctive species not to be

confused with others of the genus. The name *argus* has been widely used, not only in systematic publications but also in papers dealing with the biology of the fish. Examples are Hiatt & Strasburg, 1960; Randall & Brock, 1960; Smith & Smith, 1963; Helfrich *et al.*, 1968; Masuda *et al.*, 1975; Baissac, 1976; Allen & Steene, 1979; Jones & Kumaran, 1980; Randall, 1980; van der Elst, 1981; Shepard & Myers, 1981; Randall, 1983 and Heemstra & Randall *in* Fischer & Bianchi, 1984.

B. *Anthias argus* Bloch, 1792

4. The first use of the specific name *argus* for a grouper was that of Bloch, 1792, p. 111, pl. 317, who named *Anthias argus* from a drawing in the Linke collection in Leipzig. Bloch's colour painting shows a pale bluish-gray fish with scattered, small, brown spots or ocelli on head, body and fins (with about 21 spots or ocelli on the body). In his brief description, Bloch gave the dorsal fin ray count of 9 spines and 13 soft-rays (which agrees with the illustration). The general morphology, spotted color pattern, and 9 dorsal fin spines can only indicate a species of *Cephalopholis*, but no known species of this genus has 13 dorsal soft-rays, and none have a bluish-gray body with so few spots. There is no indication in Schneider's later account of *Cephalopholis argus* (Bloch & Schneider, 1801, p. 311) that he considered *Anthias argus* to be the same species. What is clear is that *Anthias argus* Bloch, 1792, is definitely a species of *Cephalopholis* and as such threatens the familiar name *Cephalopholis argus* Schneider, 1801, as a senior secondary homonym. Therefore, in order to maintain stability we request that the Commission suppress *Anthias argus* Bloch.

C. *Cephalopholis sexmaculata* (Rüppell, 1830)

5. *Serranus zanana* was first described by Valenciennes *in* Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1828, p. 339, from a dried half skin of the left side (MNHN 7271, 380 mm SL) collected at Mauritius by Commerson. Günther, 1859, p. 123, recognised this fish as a valid species and placed *Serranus spilurus* Valenciennes *in* Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1833, p. 433, in synonymy. The latter is now known to be a junior synonym of *Labrus leopardus* Lacepède, 1801, p. 450. Boulenger, 1895, p. 195, referred both *zanana* and *spilurus* to the synonymy of *leopardus*. Examination of the holotype of *zanana*, however, has revealed that this name is the earliest for the Indo-Pacific grouper *Serranus sexmaculatus* Rüppell, 1830. Had Valenciennes given the size of the holotype, Günther and Boulenger would surely not have erred in their synonymies, as *C. leopardus* attains a maximum standard length of only about 150 mm.

6. *Cephalopholis sexmaculata* is known throughout most of the tropical and subtropical Indo-Pacific region from the Red Sea (type locality) to French Polynesia. It is a well defined species for which only one junior synonym has been described. *C. coatesi* Whitley, 1937, from Queensland. The name *sexmaculata* has been in use since it was proposed and *zanana* has never been adopted for this species after the original

description except incorrectly as a supposed equivalent to *leopardus*. We request therefore, that the Commission suppress *Serranus zanana* Valenciennes. Recent authors who have used the name *Cephalopholis sexmaculata* (or *sexmaculatus*) include Katayama, 1960; Baissac, 1976; Masuda *et al.*, 1975; Allen & Steene, 1979; Rau & Rau, 1980; Shepard & Myers, 1981; Kyushin *et al.*, 1982; Morgans, 1982; Randall, 1983; Russell, 1983 and Heemstra & Randall *in* Fischer & Bianchi, 1984.

7. In summary the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the following specific names for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy:
    (a) *guttatus* Bloch, 1790 as published in the binomen *Bodianus guttatus*;
    (b) *zanana* Valenciennes, 1828 as published in the binomen *Serranus zanana*;

(2) to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *argus* Bloch, 1792, as published in the binomen *Anthias argus*, for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy;

(3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
    (a) *argus* Schneider, 1801, as published in the binomen *Cephalopholis argus*;
    (b) *sexmaculata* Rüppell, 1830, as published in the binomen *Cephalopholis sexmaculata*;

(4) to place the following specific names on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology:
    (a) *guttatus* Bloch, 1790, as published in the binomen *Bodianus guttatus* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1a) above;
    (b) *zanana* Valenciennes, 1828, as published in the binomen *Serranus zanana* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1b) above.
    (c) *argus* Bloch, 1792, as published in the binomen *Anthias argus* and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (2) above.

REFERENCES

ALLEN, G. R. & STEENE, R. C. 1979. The Fishes of Christmas Island, Indian Ocean. *Spec. Publ. Aust. natl. Pks. Wild. Serv.*, no. 2, pp. 1–81.

BAISSAC, J. DE B. 1976. Poissons de mer des eaux de l'île Maurice. *Proc. roy. Soc. Mauritius*, vol. 3, pt. 2, pp. 191–226.

BLOCH, M. E. 1785–1795. *Naturgeschichte der Ausländischen Fische*, 9 parts. J. Morino & Co. Berlin.

———& SCHNEIDER, J. G. 1801. *Systema ichthyologiae*, 584 pp. Sanderiano Commissum, Berolini.

BOULENGER, G. A. 1895. *Catalogue of the fishes in the British Museum*, vol. 1, 391 pp. British Museum (Natural History), London.

CUVIER, G. & VALENCIENNES, A. 1828. *Histoire naturelle des poissons*, vol. 2, 490 pp. F. G. Levrault, Paris.

———1833. *Histoire naturelle des poissons*, vol. 9, 512 pp. F. G. Levrault, Paris.

———1840. *Histoire naturalle des poissons*, vol. 14, 464 pp. Pitois Levrault, Paris.

FISCHER, W. & BIANCHI, G. 1984. FAO species identification sheets for fishery purposes. Western Indian Ocean. 10 volumes. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.

FORSSKAL, P. 1775. *Descriptiones animalium piscium*, pp. 22–75. Mölleri, Hauniae.

GUNTHER, A. A. L. G. 1859. *Catalogue of the fishes in the collection of the British Museum*, vol. 1, xxxi + 524 pp. Taylor & Francis, London.

HELFRICH, P., PIYAKARNCHANA, T. & MILES, P. S. 1968. Ciguatera fish poisoning I. The ecology of ciguateric reef fishes in the Line Islands. *Occ. pap. Bernice P. Bishop Mus.*, vol. 23(14), pp. 305–382.

HIATT, R. W. & STRASBURG, D. W. 1960. Ecological relationships of the fish fauna on coral reefs of the Marshall Islands. *Ecol. Monogr.*, vol. 30, pp. 65–127.

JONES, S. & KUMARAN, M. 1980. *Fishes of the Laccadive Archipelago*, xii + 760 pp. Nature Conserv. Aquatic Sci. Serv., Trivandrum, Kerala.

KATAYAMA, M. 1960. *Fauna Japonica Serranidae (Pisces)*. viii + 189 pp. Tokyo News Service Ltd, Tokyo.

KYUSHIN, K., AMAOKA, K., NAKAYA, K., IDA, H., TANINO, Y. & SENTA, T. 1982. *Fishes of the South China Sea*, 333 pp. Japan Mar. Fish. Resource Res. Center, Tokyo.

LACEPEDE, B. G. E. 1801. *Histoire naturelle des poissons*, vol. 3, xxvii + 414 pp. Chez Plassan, Paris.

LINNAEUS, C. 1758. *Systema Naturae*, ed. 10, vol. 1, 823 pp. Holmiae.

MASUDA, H., ARAGA, C. & YOSHINO, T. 1975. *Coastal fishes of Southern Japan*, 382 pp. Tokyo University Press.

MORGANS, J. F. C. 1982. Serranid fishes of Tanzania and Kenya. *Ichthyol. Bull. J. L. B. Smith Inst. Ichthyol.*, no. 46, pp. 1–44.

RANDALL, J. E. 1980. A survey of ciguatera at Enewetak and Bikini, Marshall Islands, with notes on the systematics and food habits of ciguatoxic fishes. *Fish. Bull.*, vol. 78(2), pp. 201–249.

———1983. *Red Sea reef fishes*, 192 pp. IMMEL Publishing, London.

———& BROCK, V. E. 1960. Observations on the ecology of epinepheline and lutjanid fishes of the Society Islands with emphasis on food habits. *Trans. amer. Fish. Soc.*, vol. 89(1), pp. 9–16.

RAU, N. & RAU, A. 1980. *Commercial marine fishes of the Central Philippines (bony fishes)*, 623 pp. Deutsche Gesellschaft für technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH, Eschborn.

RÜPPELL, E. 1828–1830. *Atlas zu der Reise im nördlichen Afrika. Fische des rothen Meers*, 141 pp. H. L. Brönner, Frankfurt am Main.

RUSSELL, B. C. 1983. Annotated checklist of the coral reef fishes in the Capricorn-Bunker Group, Great Barrier Reef, Australia. *Spec. Publ. Great Barrier Reef Mar. Park Auth.*, no. 1, pp. 1–184.

SHEPARD, J. W. & MYERS, R. F. 1981. A preliminary checklist of the fishes of Guam and the Southern Mariana Islands *in* A working list of marine organisms from Guam. *Univ. Guam mar. Lab. tech. Rep.*, no. 70, pp. 61–88.

SMITH, C. L. 1971. A revision of the American groupers: *Epinephelus* and allied genera. *Bull. amer. Mus. nat. Hist.*, vol. 146(2), pp. 67–242.

SMITH, J. L. B. & SMITH, M. M. 1963. *The fishes of Seychelles*, 215 pp. Dept. of Ichthyology, Rhodes University, Grahamstown.

VAN DER ELST, R. 1981. *A guide to the common sea fishes of southern Africa*, 367 pp. C. Struik Publishers (Pty) Ltd., Cape Town.

WHITLEY, G. 1937. Further ichthyological miscellanea. *Mem. Queensland Mus.*, vol. 9(2), pp. 113–148.

CHEIRURUS BEYRICH, 1845 (TRILOBITA): PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF *CHEIRURUS INSIGNIS* BEYRICH, 1845 AS A TYPE SPECIES. Z.N.(S.)2337

By P. D. Lane (*Geology Department, Keele University, Staffs, ST5 5BG, U.K.*)

The generic name *Cheirurus* Beyrich, 1845, p. 5 was proposed to include species now assigned to a morphologically diverse family of trilobites. Amongst them were included the species *C. insignis* Beyrich, 1845 and *C. sternbergii* (Boeck, 1828).

2. Whidborne, 1889, p. 11 designated *Trilobites sternbergii* (Boeck) 1827 (*sic*) = 1828, p. 37, as type species of *Cheirurus*.

3. Barton, 1913, p. 547 designated *Cheirurus insignis* Beyrich, 1845 as type species of *Cheirurus*.

4. The first designation has been overlooked and *T. sternbergii* has, to the best of the author's knowledge, never been used as type species of *Cheirurus*.

5. The second designation has been followed by all subsequent authors.

6. Strict application of the Code would result in the acceptance of *T. sternbergii* as type species of *Cheirurus*. However, *T. sternbergii* has been accepted as type species of *Boeckia* Pillet, 1965 (*non* Malm, 1870; *nec* Brady, 1871; *nec* Brögger, 1882; *nec* Thomson, 1883; *nec* Grimm *in* Sars, 1894) = *Pilletopeltis nov. nom.* Přibyl & Vaněk, 1973, p. 46. The name *Cheirurus* would be transferred from the genus to which it has been applied since 1846 (Barrande 1846a, p. 75; 1846b, p. 31) to the genus known since 1972 as *Pilletopeltis*; and a new name would have to be found for *Cheirurus* of authors.

7. A list of 10 papers by 10 authors who use *C. insignis* as type species of *Cheirurus* is attached.

8. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species made for the genus *Cheirurus* Beyrich, 1845, prior to the designation by Barton, 1913, of *Cheirurus insignis* Beyrich, 1845, to be the type species of that genus;

(2) to place the generic name *Cheirurus* Beyrich, 1845 (gender: masculine) type species, by subsequent designation by Barton, 1913, *Cheirurus insignis* Beyrich, 1845, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *insignis* Beyrich, 1845, as published in the binomen *Cheirurus insignis* Beyrich, 1845, (specific name of the type species of *Cheirurus* Beyrich, 1845) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

BARRANDE, J. 1846a. *Notice préliminaire sur le Système Silurien et les trilobites de Bohême*, pp. 1–97. Leipsic.

———1846b. *Nouveaux trilobites. Supplément à la notice préliminaire sur le Système Silurien et les trilobites de Bohême.* pp. 1–40. Prague.

BARTON, D. C. 1913. A new genus of the Cheiruridae with descriptions of some new species. *Bull. Mus. comp. Zool. Harv.* vol. 54, no. 21. pp. 547–556, 1 pl. (un-numbered).

BEYRICH, E. 1845. *Ueber einige böhmischen Trilobiten.* 47 pp, 1 pl. Berlin.

BOECK, C. 1828. Notitser til Laeren om Trilobiterne. *Mag. Naturvidensk.* for 1827, vol. 8, pp. 11–44, 1 pl.

BRADY, G. S. 1871. A list of the non-parasitic marine Copepoda of the North-east coast of England. *Nat. Hist. Trans. Northumberland Durham,* vol. 4, pp. 423–445, pls. 17–21.

BRÖGGER, W. C. 1882. *Die silurischen Etagen 2 und 3* im *Kristianagebiet und auf Eker, ihre Gliederung, Fossilien, Schichtenstorungen und Contactmetamorphosen.* Universitäts-programm (Kristiania). 376 pp., 12 pls.

MALM, A. W. 1870. Om två för vetenskapen nya Amfipod-species från Bohuslän, af hvilka det ena är typ för ett nytt genus inom Pontoporeinernas grupp. *Ofvers Vetensk Akad. Forh. Stockholm*, vol. 27, pp. 543–548, pl. 5.

PILLET, J. 1965. Le genre *Crotalocephalus* dans le massif Armoricain. *Bull. Soc. géol. min. Bretagne.* Nouvelle Série. pp. 1–65, pls. 1–4.

PŘIBYL, A. & VANĚK, J. 1972. *In* PILLET, J. Les Trilobites du Dévonien inférieur et du Dévonien moyen du Sud-Est du Massif armoricain. *Mém. Soc. Et. Sci. Anjou* no. 1, pp. 1–307, pls. 1–64.

SARS, G. O. 1894. Crustacea Caspia. Contributions to the knowledge of the Carcinological Fauna of the Caspain Sea. *Bull. Acad. imp. Sci. St. Pétersbourg,* series 5, vol. 1, pp. 179–223, pls. 1–8.

THOMSON, G. M. 1883. On the New Zealand Copepoda. *Trans. New Zealand Inst.* vol. 15, pp. 93–116, pls. 5–11.

WHIDBORNE, G. F. 1889. A monograph of the Devonian fauna of the south of England. Vol. 1. The fauna of the limestones of Lummaton, Wolborough, Chircombe Bridge, and Chudleigh. *Monogr. palaeontogr. Soc.* London. pp. 1–46, pls. 1–4.

LIST OF TEN WORKS BY TEN DIFFERENT AUTHORS, PUBLISHED IN THE LAST FORTY YEARS, IN WHICH THE TYPE SPECIES OF *CHEIRURUS* IS REGARDED AS *CHEIRURUS INSIGNIS* BEYRICH, 1845

BALASHOVA, E. A. 1960. Cheiruridae. *In* CHERNYSHEVA, N. E., BALASHOVA, E. A., IVSHIN, N. K., KRAMARENKO, N. N., MAKSIMOVA, Z. A., POKROVSKAYA, N. V. and SUVOROVA, N. P. *In* ORLOV, YU. A. (ed.) *Principles of palaeontology. Arthropods — Trilobitomorphs and Crustaceans* (ed. CHERNYSHEVA, N. E.). Moscow. p. 174 [In Russian].

CAMPBELL, K. S. W. 1977. *Oklahoma geol. Surv. Bull.* 123, p. 111.

CHUGAEVA, M. N. 1958. *Trud. geol. Inst. [GIN] S.S.S.R.* vol. 9, p. 83. [In Russian].

HENNINGSMOEN, G. 1959. Cheiruridae. pp. *In* MOORE, R. C. (ed.) *Treatise on invertebrate paleontology*. Part O. Arthropoda 1. p. 0431.
HOLLOWAY, D. J. 1980. *Palaeontographica A*, vol. 137, p. 29.
LANE, P. D. 1971. *Monogr. palaeontogr. Soc*. London. p. 11.
NORFORD, B. S. 1981. *Geol. Surv. Canada Bull*. 327. p. 10.
PRANTL, F. & PŘIBYL, A. 1948. *Sb. nàr. Mus. Praze*, 3, *Geol*. (Paleont.), vol. 1, p. 14.
RAMSKOLD, L. 1983. *Palaeontology* vol. 26, p. 177.
THOMAS, A. T. 1981. *Monogr. Paleontogr. Soc*. London. p. 57.

EUGYNOTHRIPS PRIESNER, 1926 (INSECTA, THYSANOPTERA): PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF *CRYPTOTHRIPS CONOCEPHALI* KARNY, 1913 AS TYPE SPECIES. Z. N. (S.) 2503

By Denis J. Brothers (*Department of Entomology, University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg, 3200 South Africa*) and L. A. Mound (*Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD, U.K.*)

One of us (DJB) has undertaken to complete the Catalogue of the Thysanoptera of the World compiled by the late C. F. Jacot-Guillarmod, of which six parts were published before the author's death (*Ann. Cape. Prov. Mus. (Nat. Hist.)* vol. 7: 1970, part 1, pp. i–iv, 1–216; 1971, part 2, pp. 217–516; 1974, part 3, pp. 517–976; 1975, part 4, pp. 977–1256; 1978, part 5, pp. 1257–1556; 1979, part 6, pp. 1557–1724). During preparation of the manuscript for the seventh part, various nomenclatural problems have had to be overcome. Most of these have been relatively straightforward, but the present application involves a situation where the first designation of the type species of a genus was overlooked or ignored and a different species was subsequently designated and has been generally accepted. The two species involved are now placed in different subgenera, so that reversion to the first designation would cause confusion and necessitate a new subgenus name. The facts are as follows.

2. The genus *Eugynothrips* was established by Priesner, 1926, (*Treubia*, vol. 8 (Supplement), p. 157) to include the following species considered typical of the new genus: *Cryptothrips conocephali* Karny, 1913 (*Bull. Jard. Bot. Buitenzorg*, vol. 2, p. 98); *Cryptothrips intorquens* Karny, 1912 (*Marcellia*, vol. 11, p. 145); *Cryptothrips persimilis* Karny, 1913 (*loc cit.*, p. 96) and probably *Cryptothrips pachypus* Karny, 1913 (*loc cit.*, p. 90). The following species were also included although considered atypical: *Cryptothrips fuscipennis* Karny, 1912 (*loc cit.*, p. 142) and *Cryptothrips circinans* Karny, 1916 (*Z. wiss. InsektBiol.*, vol. 12, p. 125) and doubtfully *Cryptothrips tenuicornis* Karny, 1912 (*loc cit.*, p. 140) and *Dolerothrips tubifex* Karny, 1915 (*Z. wiss. InsektBiol.*, vol. 11, p. 249). Priesner gave no indication of which species should be considered the type, although *conocephali* was the first species treated. According to Article 67g of the Code, the only species which are legitimate candidates for designation as the type species of *Eugynothrips* are *C. conocephali, C. intorquens* and *C. persimilis* because these are the only species included by Priesner without any qualification.

3. The first mention of *Eugynothrips* to include some statement of the type species is that of Kelly & Mayne, 1934 (*The Australian Thrips: A Monograph of the Order Thysanoptera in Australia*. . ., Australasian Medical Publishing Company, Sydney, ii + 81 pp.). The account of the genus *Eugynothrips* on page 60 is as follows: 'Erected to include *Cryptothrips intorquens* and 2 Javanese spp. on account of the differences

referred to in descriptions of the genotype *C. intorquens*.' This is a clear statement that *C. intorquens* was the type species and that the authors considered it to be such. It fulfils the requirements of Article 69a (iv) and must be accepted as the first designation of a type species for *Eugynothrips*. The only species listed by Kelly & Mayne under that genus heading is *E. smilacis* Priesner, however. Their account of *C. intorquens*, which is under *Cryptothrips* on page 59, reads in part; 'Doubtful genus . . . Head shorter than in true *Cryptothrips*.' It is thus obvious that this species account was misplaced and that it was intended to be under *Eugynothrips*. The error is easily explained because the brief descriptions for each species and genus had been prepared by Kelly but they were coordinated and the final manuscript was completed by Mayne after Kelly's death. There is every indication that Mayne was unfamiliar with the complexities of the subject and compiled the manuscript to prevent the loss of his late friend's work. Kelly would certainly have noticed and corrected this and other anomalies in the text during the final preparation of the manuscript had he been able to do so. This type-species designation has been ignored by all subsequent workers.

4. Some six years after Kelly & Mayne's treatment, Ramakrishna & Margabandhu, 1940 (*Cat. Indian Ins.*, part 25, p. 50) designated the type species of *Eugynothrips* as '*E. concephali* Karny'. Priesner, 1949 (*Bull. Soc. Fouad Ier Entomol.*, vol. 33, p. 129) also gave the type species as *Cryptothrips conocephali* Karny in his world list of genera. Furthermore, in his redescription of the genus, Priesner, 1953 (*Treubia*, vol. 22, p. 357) very clearly designated *C. conocephali* as the type species. That species has generally been considered to be the type in all subsequent publications and this is the currently accepted usage (Ananthakrishnan, 1978, *Zool. Surv. India Tech. Monogr.*, 1, pp. 1–69). Furthermore, Priesner, 1952 (*Indian J. Entomol.*, vol. 13, p. 200) described *Loepothrips* as a new subgenus of *Eugynothrips*, with *Dolerothrips coarctatus* Karny as type species, and also including *Cryptothrips intorquens*, *Cryptothrips persimilis* and *Dolerothrips tubifex*. Thus two of the three species which qualify for designation as the type of *Eugynothrips*, including the species first so designated, are excluded from the subgenus *Eugynothrips*.

5. According to Article 69a of the Code, the first designation of a type species subsequent to the original description of the genus, if no type species was designated originally, is considered the valid designation as long as it fulfils the provisions of that Article. This means that Kelly & Mayne's 1934 designation should stand and all subsequent designations are invalid. In that case, *Loepothrips* would fall as a junior subjective synonym of *Eugynothrips* and a new subgeneric name would have to be provided for all species currently considered to fall in the subgenus *Eugynothrips*. This would obviously upset current usage to a considerable extent and proliferate names needlessly.

6. For the reasons set out above, we request the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made for the nominal genus *Eugynothrips* Priesner, 1926, and having done so to designate *Cryptothrips conocephali* Karny, 1913 as type species of that genus;

(2) to place the generic name *Eugynothrips* Priesner, 1926 (gender: masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Cryptothrips conocephali* Karny, 1913, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *conocephali* Karny, 1913, as published in the binomen *Cryptothrips conocephali* (type species of *Eugynothrips* Priesner, 1926) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

HETEROGYNIDAE RAMBUR, 1866 (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA) AND HETEROGYNINAE NAGY, 1969 (INSECTA, HYMENOPTERA): PROPOSALS TO REMOVE THE HOMONYMY. Z.N.(S.)2496

By M. C. Day (*Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), London SW7 5BD U.K.*)

The purpose of this application is to ask the Commission to use its plenary powers under Article 55b to direct that the stem of *Heterogyna* Nagy, 1969, for the purposes of Article 29, shall be HETEROGYNA —.

2. Rambur, 1866, p. 316, proposed a family-group name for a small group of zygaenoid moths. Based on *Heterogynis* Rambur, 1837, the name has invariably been formed as HETEROGYNIDAE (Fletcher & Nye, 1982, p. 77).

3. Nagy, 1969, p. 7, proposed a new family and superfamily of solitary wasps (HETEROGYNIDAE, — OIDEA) based on the concurrently-described monobasic genus *Heterogyna* Nagy, 1969.

4. Day, 1984, described four further species and established the relationships of *Heterogyna* Nagy. It proves to represent a group of sphecoid wasps undoubtedly deserving of family-group status; it is currently assigned status as a sub-family. A problem of homonymy of family-group names resulting from similarity rather than identity of spelling of names of type genera thus requires resolution by the Commission under Article 55b.

5. Nagy, 1969, p. 7, proposed, since he believed the zygaenoid name should properly have been formed on the stem HETEROGYNID-, that the problem could be resolved by the adoption of the spelling HETEROGYNIDIDAE. Day, 1984, p. 301, supported this view. However, my colleagues Dr Z. Bouček and Mr B. Bolton have since informed me that *Heterogynis* must be regarded as an unorthodox latinisation of the Greek 'Heterogyne'. Under Article 29b (iii), the correctly formed stem is in fact HETEROGYN — rather than HETEROGYNID —. Lepidopterists naturally would not support the adoption of Nagy's original proposal. An arbitrary modification of the stem of *Heterogyna* is thus proposed, such that the family-group name based upon it be formed as HETEROGYNAINAE (or HETEROGYNAIDAE as the case may be).

6. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to rule that the stem of *Heterogyna* Nagy, 1969, for the purposes of Article 29 is HETEROGYNA —;

(2) to place the following names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:

  (a) *Heterogynis* Rambur, 1837 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Kirby, 1892, *Heterogynis paradoxa* Rambur, 1837 (Insecta, Lepidoptera);

(b) *Heterogyna* Nagy, 1969 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Heterogyna protea* Nagy, 1969 (Insecta, Hymenoptera);

(3) to place the following names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *paradoxa* Rambur, 1837, as published in the binomen *Heterogynis paradoxa* (specific name of the type species of *Heterogynis* Rambur, 1837);
   (b) *protea* Nagy, 1969, as published in the binomen *Heterogyna protea* (specific name of the type species of *Heterogyna* Nagy, 1969).

(4) to place the following names on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology:
   (a) HETEROGYNIDAE Rambur, 1866 (type genus *Heterogynis* Rambur, 1837) (Insecta, Lepidoptera);
   (b) HETEROGYNAIDAE Nagy, 1969 (emendation, through the ruling under the plenary powers in (1) above, of HETEROGYNIDAE Nagy, 1969), type genus *Heterogyna* Nagy, 1969. (Insecta, Hymenoptera);

(5) to place the family-group name HETEROGYNIDAE Nagy, 1969 (a junior homonym of HETEROGYNIDAE Rambur, 1866) on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

DAY, M. C. 1984. The enigmatic genus *Heterogyna* Nagy (Hymenoptera: Sphecidae; Heterogyninae). *Syst. Entomol.*, vol. 9, pp. 293–307.

FLETCHER, D. S. & NYE, I. W. B. 1982 *in* NYE, I. W. B. (*Ed*). *The generic names of the moths of the World* Vol. 4. xiv + 192 pp. London.

KIRBY, W. F. 1892. *A synonymic catalogue of Lepidoptera Heterocera (moths).* xii + 957 pp. London.

NAGY, C. G. 1969. A new taxon of the family Heterogynidae Latreille (Hym., Aculeata). *Entomol. Mitt. zool. Staatsinst. zool. Mus. Hamburg*, No. 64, pp. 7–12.

RAMBUR, P. 1837. Notice sur plusieurs Lépidoptères du Midi de l'Espange, parmi lesquels se trouve le papillon eupheme d' Espar. *Ann. Soc. entomol. France*, vol. 5, pp. 573–588.

——— 1866. *Catalogue systématique des Lépidoptères de l'Andalousie* Vol. 2. 93–412 pp. Paris.

REQUEST FOR A RULING THAT FRENCH THESES SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF *DOCTEUR DU TROISIEME CYCLE* ARE NOT PUBLISHED Z.N. (S) 2497

By G. C. Hewitt (*Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand*) and Madame V. Rousset (*Université de Montpellier, 34060 Montpellier, France*)

Confusion can and does arise in zoological nomenclature as a result of misunderstandings about dates of publication. The Code also lays down rules as to what constitutes publication. Theses in French universities for the *Doctorat d'Etat* clearly satisfy these rules and are generally recognized as publications. As many as 200 copies may be produced, they are widely distributed and are assigned an ISB number.

2. However, the position of theses for *Docteur du Troisième Cycle* is less clear. For most purposes these are not treated as publications and they are not assigned an ISB number. Up till now they have been quoted as unpublished works by other researchers. Nevertheless, there are numerous individual theses that were produced and distributed in a way that might be thought to satisfy Article 8 of the Code. Each thesis is produced by a process that can assure numerous identical copies, and the copies so produced are simultaneously obtainable. In some cases 64 copies are produced and most of these are distributed to libraries. Are such theses to be considered published or not?

3. It seems clear that the theses in question cannot be excluded under the provisions of either Article 9(8) 'distribution only to colleagues or students of a note' without unduly stretching the meaning of 'note'; or under Article 9(11) 'deposit of a document (e.g. a thesis) in a collection of documents, a library or other archive'. Nor do we suggest that a precise value be placed on the word 'numerous' in the expression 'numerous identical copies'. On the other hand, the present is a good time to take action, for third cycle doctorates were phased out from the beginning of the 1984–85 academic year. We understand that new French theses started in 1984 will be distributed in the same way as theses for the *Doctorat d'Etat* and will thus be considered as valid publications.

4. We believe that the method of distribution of the third cycle theses is not in accordance with the spirit of Article 8 of the Code, and that this justifies the Commission in ruling that they are unpublished. The method of distribution is specified in an official decision (*arrêté*) dated 24 February 1976 in the *Journal officiel* of the French republic. This states that the copies must be distributed as follows:

> Three copies for deposit in the library of the university where the work was done;
>
> One copy to the relevant documentation centre of the *Centre National de Recherche Scientifique;*
>
> 60 copies to the library of the university where the work was done for use in inter–university exchanges.

The first two items clearly fall under Article 9(11). As for the third item, since inter-university exchanges are normally the subject of standard and long-lasting arrangements, the destination of each copy must be determined in advance, and no copies of these theses are 'obtainable free of charge or by purchase' (Article 8(2)). This defect, in our opinion, justifies the ruling we seek.

5. The alternative course, to consider each thesis individually on its merits, seems certain to lead to confusion.

6. Theses produced in many countries for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy contain important taxonomic contributions which are unavailable because the theses in which they appear remain unpublished. We hope that these countries will follow the example of France and the *Doctorat d'Etat* and ensure that theses accepted for such degrees are published in such a way as to satisfy the Code.

7. We therefore ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to rule that theses for the degree of *Docteur du Troisième Cycle* in French universities are not published because, when they are first produced, no copies are obtainable free of charge or by purchase, as required by Article 8(2) of the Code.

THAIDIDAE JOUSSEAUME, 1888 (MOLLUSCA, GASTROPODA) AND THAIDIDAE LEHTINEN, 1967 (ARACHNIDA, ARANEAE): PROPOSALS TO REMOVE THE HOMONYMY. Z.N.(S.)2307

(see vol. 37, p. 148)

By Pekka T. Lehtinen (*University of Turku, Finland*)

Recently, Cernohorsky (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 37, p. 148) pointed out that the correct author and date for the Gastropod family name THAIDIDAE is Jousseaume, 1888, not Suter, 1913, as given in Opinion 886 (1969) and in the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology under Name Number 439. This proposal now falls to be considered in a nomenclatural situation that did not exist when the original application that led to Opinion 886 was made (Keen, 1964, *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 21, pp. 235–239). It did exist, however, when the two votes on that application were taken (1968, 1969) but was not made known to the Commission.

2. *Thaida* Karsch, 1880, *Z. gesamt. Wiss.* vol. 53 (ser. 3, vol. 6), p. 389, type species, by monotypy, *Thaida peculiaris* Karsch, 1880, ibid., was found to be a senior subjective synonym of *Austrochilus* Gertsch in Zapfe, 1955, *Trab. Lab. Zool. Univ. Chile,* vol. 2, p. 47, type species, by original designation, *Austrochilus manni* Gertsch in Zapfe, 1955, ibid., pp. 47–49. *Thaida* Karsch was made type genus of the monotypic family THAIDIDAE by Lehtinen, 1967, *Ann. zool. Fenn.* vol. 4, pp. 217, 269. Zapfe, 1955, had erected the subfamily AUSTROCHILINAE for *Austrochilus.*

3. Marples, 1968, *Proc. linn. Soc. London* (Zool.) vol. 179, pp. 11–31 raised AUSTROCHILINAE to family rank, but otherwise all who have discussed the status of this group have accepted the synonymy of *Thaida* and *Austrochilus* and the family name THAIDIDAE Lehtinen (Platnick, 1977, *Amer. Mus. Novit.* no. 2627, 23 pp.; 1978, *Symp. zool. Soc. London,* vol. 42, p. 498; Lehtinen, 1978, *Symp. zool. Soc. London,* vol. 42, pp. pp. 255–271; 1980, *Verh. 8 int. Arachn.–Kongr.,* pp. 493–498; Brignoli, 1978, *Symp. zool. Soc. London,* vol. 42, pp. 285–292; Forster, 1980, *Verh. 8 int. Arachn.–Kongr.,* pp. 269–284.

4. Lehtinen, 1967, pp. 296–299, after detailed analysis of the evolution of the Hypochilomorpha, showed that the THAIDIDAE belong to a branch of spider evolution that does not include any other previously established families, and the authors cited all accept the isolated position of this group. A superfamily THAIDOIDEA has been established as has a taxon, Thaidides, above the level of the family group. Possible different interpretations of the taxonomic status of this class above the level of the family group (cf. Platnick, 1977) show that several names for taxa at that level can be used, all based on *Thaida*. The taxonomic loading on the name is thus considerable, and the evolutionary implications that it carries with it are of the highest interest and importance.

5. The name AUSTROCHILIDAE had received very little usage before its synonymy with THAIDIDAE Lehtinen was recognised. There is no acceptable

alternative to THAID– as the stem for family-group (and higher) names in this group of spiders.

6. Dr Cernohorsky, in reply to a suggestion from the Secretary to the Commission, said (letter, 13 August 1984): 'I have no objection at all to accepting THAISIDAE instead of THAIDIDAE, and should this simple change of one letter resolve the issue, let us accept it by all means. Several workers in the past have spelt the name THAISIDAE.' This was in fact the original spelling used by Jousseaume, 1888, *Mém. Soc. zool. France,* vol. 1, p. 179.

7. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers:
  (a) to rule that the stem of the generic name *Thais* [Röding], 1798, for the purposes of Article 29 is THAIS–;
  (b) to rule that THAIDIDAE Lehtinen, 1967 is to be given nomenclatural precedence over AUSTROCHILIDAE Zapfe, 1955 by anyone who believes the names to be synonyms;
(2) to place the following generic names on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
  (a) *Austrochilus* Gertsch, in Zapfe, 1955 (gender: masculine), type species, by original designation, *Austrochilus manni* Gertsch in Zapfe, 1955;
  (b) *Thaida* Karsch, 1880 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, *Thaida peculiaris* Karsch, 1880;
(3) to place the following specific names on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
  (a) *manni* Gertsch in Zapfe, 1955, as published in the binomen *Austrochilus manni* (specific name of type species of *Austrochilus* Gertsch in Zapfe, 1955);
  (b) *peculiaris* Karsch, 1880, as published in the binomen *Thaida peculiaris* (specific name of type species of *Thaida* Karsch, 1880;
(4) to alter entry no. 439 in the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology to read 'THAISIDAE Jousseaume, 1888';
(5) to place on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology:
  (a) AUSTROCHILIDAE Zapfe, 1955 (type genus *Austrochilus* Gertsch in Zapfe, 1955);
  (b) THAIDIDAE Lehtinen, 1967 (type genus *Thaida* Karsch, 1880).

DRASTERIUS BIMACULATUS (ROSSI, 1790) (INSECTA, COLEOPTERA, ELATERIDAE): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY SUPPRESSION OF *ELATER BIMACULATUS* FOURCROY, 1785

Z.N.(S.) 2345.

By Maciej Mroczkowski (*Institute of Zoology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland*)

In 1785 A. F. de Fourcroy (*Entomologia parisiensis* (1). p. 38) described from the surroundings of Paris a species called *Elater bimaculatus*. Since the description the name *bimaculatus* of Fourcroy has not been used as a valid name. *Elater bimaculatus* Fourcroy, 1785 is a junior synonym of *Elater bipustulatus* Linnaeus, 1767 (*Syst. Nat.* ed. 12, p. 652), now *Calambus bipustulatus*, a very well known European species.

2. In 1790 P. Rossi (*Fauna etrusca*, vol. 1, p. 182) described from Italy another species called *Elater bimaculatus*, now *Drasterius bimaculatus* (Rossi). *Drasterius bimaculatus* (Rossi) is a common Palaearctic species (from North Africa through South Europe to the Caucasus). The name *bimaculatus* (Rossi) has been in continuous use till now. The oldest available synonym is *Elater binotatus* Rossi, 1792 (*Mant. Ins.* vol. 1, p. 59) — the name now used for a variety of the species *Drasterius bimaculatus* var. *binotatus* (Rossi) (see Leseigneur, 1972, p. 62). *Elater bimaculatus* Rossi, 1790, is the type species of the genus *Drasterius* Eschholz [= Eschscholtz], 1829 (in Thon, Ent, Arch, II, 1, p. 33) by subsequent designation by Westwood, 1840, *Introd. mod. class. ins.*, vol. 2, Generic Synopsis, p. 26.

3. As the application of the law of homonymy would disrupt stability and cause confusion and as on the other hand *Elater bimaculatus* Fourcroy, 1785 is an unused senior synonym, I ask the Commission to take the following actions:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *bimaculatus* Fourcroy, 1785, as published in the combination *Elater bimaculatus*, and all uses prior to the publication of *Elater bimaculatus* Rossi, 1790 for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy;

(2) to place the specific name *bimaculatus* Rossi, 1790, as published in the binomen *Elater bimaculatus*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(3) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology the specific name *bimaculatus* Fourcroy, 1785, as published in the binomen *Elater bimaculatus*, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above.

REFERENCES

ESCHHOLZ [=ESCHSCHOLTZ] Fr. 1829. Elaterites, Eintheilung derselben in Gattungen. *Entomol. Archiv* (Thon), Jena, vol. 2, pp. 31–35.

FOURCROY, A. F. 1785. *Entomologia parisiensis; sive Catalogus Insectorum quae in Agro Parisiensi reperiuntur; secundum methodum Geoffraeanam in sectiones, genera et species distributus: Cui addita sunt nomina trivialia et fere trecentae novae Species*. Pars prima. Parisiis, VIII + 544 pp.

LESEIGNEUR, L. 1972. Coléoptères Elateridae de la France Continentale et de Corse. *Bull. mens. Soc. linn. Lyon*, vol. 41, Suppl., 381 pp., 384 ff.

ROSSI, P. 1790. *Fauna etrusca sistens insecta quae in provinciis Florentina et Pisana praesertim collegit*. Tomus primus. Liburni, XXII + 272 pp.

ROSSI, P. 1792. *Mantissa Insectorum exhibens species nuper in Etruria collectas adiectis faunae Etruscae illustrationibus, ac emendationibus*. Vol. I. Pisa, 148 pp.

MICROCHRYSA LOEW, 1855 (INSECTA, DIPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *CHRYSOMYIA* MACQUART, 1834. Z.N.(S.)2453

By Emilia P. Nartshuk (*Zoological Institut, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Leningrad, USSR*) and Rudolf Rozkošný (*Department of Environmental Studies, Natural Science Faculty, J. E. Purkyně University, Brno, ČSSR*)

Macquart, 1834, p.262, established the genus *Chrysomyia* for five species. One of them, *Musca polita* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 598, was designated as type species of *Chrysomyia* by Westwood, 1840, p. 130; it is also the type species of the genus *Microchrysa* Loew, 1855, p. 146, as originally designated. Another originally included species, *Sargus xanthopterus* Meigen, 1804 (= *Musca formosa* Scopoli, 1763), wrongly cited as *Nemotelus xanthopterus* DeGeer, was designated as type species of *Chrysomyia* Macquart (as *Chrysomya*) by Rondani, 1856, p. 468). It is also the type species of the genus *Chloromyia* Duncan, 1837. Later authors overlooked Westwood's type designation and, accepting that made by Rondani, placed *Chrysomyia* Macquart in objective synonymy of *Chloromyia* Duncan.

2. *Chrysomyia* Macquart, 1834 has not been used as a valid name in the primary zoological literature during the last 50 years because it was regarded as preoccupied by *Chrysomya* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, now a valid name in the dipteran family CALLIPHORIDAE. However, as they differ in one letter these names are not homonyms, although in the past emendations such as *Chrysomya* Rondani, 1856 (for *-myia* Macquart) and *Chrysomyia* Macquart, 1835 (for *-mya* Robineau-Desvoidy) have been used.

3. *Microchrysa* Loew, 1855 includes 36 mostly common species from all parts of the world. The genus name is used in numerous publications from which those of Dušek & Rozkošný, 1964; Lindner, 1936; Lobanov, 1969; Majer, 1977; Nagatomi, 1974; Nartshuk, 1969; Oldroyd, 1969; Rozkošný, 1973, 1982; Stackelberg, 1954 and Trojan, 1963 are indicated here for the fulfilment of the provisions of Article 79c of the Code.

4. In accordance with Article 79c of the Code, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Chrysomyia* Macquart, 1834 for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;
(2) to place the generic name *Microchrysa* Loew, 1855 (gender: feminine), type species, by original designation, *Musca polita* Linnaeus, 1758, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
(3) to place the specific name *polita* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Musca polita* (specific name of the type species of *Microchrysa* Loew, 1855) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) To place the generic name *Chrysomyia* Macquart, 1834, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Our sincere thanks to Dr I. M. Kerzhner for his help and advice.

REFERENCES

DUŠEK, J. & ROZKOŠNÝ, R. 1964. Revision mitteleuropäischer Arten der Familie Stratiomyidae (Diptera) mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Fauna der ČSSR. *Acta. Soc. Entomol. Čechosloveniae,* vol. 61(4), pp. 360–373.

LINDNER, E. 1936. Stratiomyiidae. (in part) [Family] No. 18, pp 1–48 (Lief. 104) *in* Lindner, E. (ed.), *Die Fliegen der paläarktischen Region.*

LOBANOV, A. M. 1969. On the morphology and ecology of larvae chamaeleon flies of the subfamily Sarginae (Diptera, Stratiomyidae). *Entomol. Obozr.,* vol. 48(1), pp. 104–107 (in Russian).

LOEW, H. 1855. Einige Bemerkungen über Gattung Sargus. *Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien,* vol. 5, pp. 131–148.

MACQUART, J. 1834. *Histoire naturelle des Insectes. Diptères.,* vol. 1, 578 pp. Paris.

——— 1835. *Histoire naturelle des Insectes. Diptères.,* vol. 2, 710 pp. Paris.

MAJER, J. 1977. Katonalegyek—gömblegyek, Stratiomyidae—Acroceridae. Diptera I. *Faun. Hungariae,* No. 129, vol. 14(10), pp. 1–75.

NAGATOMI, A. 1977. The Sarginae and Pachygasterinae of Japan (Diptera; Stratiomyidae). *Trans. R. entomol. Soc. London,* vol. 126(3), pp. 305–421.

NARTSHUK, E. P. 1969. Fam. Stratiomyidae *in Key to identification of insects of the european part of the USSR,* vol. 5(1), pp. 454–481. Leningrad (in Russian).

OLDROYD, H. 1969 Diptera Brachycera. Section (a). Tabanoidea and Asiloidea *in Handbook for the identification of British insects,* vol. 9(4), 128 pp. London.

RONDANI, C. 1856. *Dipterologiae Italicae Prodromus,* vol. 1, 174 pp. Parmae.

ROZKOŠNÝ, R. 1973. *The Stratiomyioidea (Diptera) of Fennoscandia and Danmark. Fauna. Entomol. Scandinavica,* vol. 1, 140 pp.

——— 1973. *A biosystematic study of the European Stratiomyidae (Diptera),* vol. 1, 401 pp. The Hague–Boston–London.

STACKELBERG, A. A. 1954. On the Diptera fauna of the Leningrad Region. II. Diptera, Brachycera. *Trudý. zool. Inst. Leningrad,* vol. 15, pp. 199–228. (in Russian).

TROJAN, P. 1963. Muchowki — Diptera. Zesz, 22. Stratiomyidae. *Klucze oznacz. owad. Polski,* No. 41, vol. 28(22). pp 1–72.

WESTWOOD, J. O. 1840. *Synopsis of the genera of British Insects* (part). Orders XIII Diptera, pp. 125–154. London.

MUSCA TRILINEATA LINNAEUS, 1767 (INSECTA, DIPTERA): PROPOSED CONSERVATION BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *MUSCA GRAECA* PONTOPPIDAN, 1763, Z.N.(S.)2454

By Emilia P. Nartshuk (*Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Leningrad, U.S.S.R.*) and Rudolf Rozkošný (*Department of Environmental Studies, Natural Science Faculty, J. E. Purkyně University, Brno, Č.S.S.R.*)

The purpose of this application is to ask the Commission to suppress a virtually unused senior synonym of a common and well known Palaearctic stratiomyid, *Oxycera trilineata* (Linnaeus, 1767).

2. Brünnich, 1761, p. 29, published a description of a remarkable un-named fly from Denmark, having a black abdominal marking resembling the Greek letter 'theta'. Pontoppidan, 1763, p. 696, published a figure of this species, accompanied by a statement that the species was new, by reference to Brünnich's description and by the name *Musca graeca*. The same data are repeated in a German translation of the work (Pontoppidan, 1766; [1] The specific name *graeca*, accompanied by references and a short description, was also used by Pontoppidan, 1765, p. 229 (as *Musca*) and Müller, 1776, p. 177 (as *Stratiomys?*).

3. The name was overlooked by all subsequent workers until Lundbeck, 1907, p. 34, pointed out that *Musca graeca* Pontoppidan, 1763 is undoubtedly conspecific with *M. trilineata* Linnaeus, 1767. However, as Pontoppidan, 1763 did not give any description, Lundbeck wrongly regarded his name as unavailable. Lindner, 1938, mentions '*graeca* Pontoppidan' among the synonyms of *Oxycera trilineata* (Linnaeus). To our knowledge, for over 150 years the name *graeca* Pontoppidan was never used as a valid name in the primary zoological literature.

4. *Musca trilineata* was described by Linnaeus, 1767, p. 980, from Sweden. It is now placed in the genus *Oxycera* Meigen, 1803, but has, in the past, been wrongly attributed to Fabricius, 1781 (see Lundbeck, 1907 p. 33). *Oxycera trilineata* (Linnaeus) is the commonest species of the genus distributed over nearly the whole Palaearctic. During the last 50 years the name has been used as valid in dozens of publications including keys of regional faunas, faunistic lists and biocoenological papers. Those of Bańkowska, 1967; Brindle, 1964; Cowan, 1977; Dušek & Rozkošný, 1974; Majer, 1977; Nartshuk, 1969, Oldroyd, 1969; Rozkošný, 1983; Stackelberg, 1954; Trojan, 1963 and Zimina, 1976 are cited here to satisfy the provisions of Article 79(b) of the Code.

---

[1] There were two editions of the German translation of Pontoppidan's Atlas: in 1765 and 1766 (see *Bibliotheca Danica*). Authors have seen the 1766 edition.

5. In view of the above evidence, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked:

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress the specific name *graeca* Pontoppidan, 1763, as published in the binomen *Musca graeca*, for the purposes of the Principle of Priority but not for those of the Principle of Homonymy;
(2) to place the specific name *trilineata* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen *Musca trilineata*, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;
(3) to place the specific name *graeca* Pontoppidan, 1763, as published in the binomen *Musca graeca*, and as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above, on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are greatly indebted to Dr I. M. Kerzhner, Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Leningrad, U.S.S.R., for aid and advice.

REFERENCES

BAŃKOWSKA, R. 1967. Matériaux pour l'étude des Diptères de Bulgarie (Stratiomyidae, Conopidae, Pipunculidae et Acroceridae). *Fragm. faun.*, vol. 13, pp. 303–314.

BRINDLE, A. 1964. Taxonomic notes on the larvae of British Diptera. The Clitellariinae (Stratiomyidae). *Entomol.*, vol. 97, pp. 134–139.

BRÜNNICH, M. TH. 1761. *Prodromus insectologiae siaellandicae*. Hafniae, 31 pp.

COWAN, C. F. 1977. *Oxycera trilineata*, (L.) (Diptera) new to Cumbria. *Entomol. Rec. J. Var.*, vol. 89(6), p. 177.

DUŠEK, J. & ROZKOŠNÝ, R. 1974. Revision mitteleuropäischer Arten der Familie Stratiomyidae (Diptera) mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Fauna der Č.S.S.R. V. Gattung *Oxycera* Meigen. *Acta bohemoslov.*, vol. 71, pp. 322–341.

LINDNER, E. 1938. Stratiomyiidae. (In part) No. 18, pp. 177–218 (Lief. 116) *in* Lindner, E. (ed.), *Die Fliegen der paläarktischen Region*, vol. 4 (1), No. 18–24.

LINNAEUS, C. 1767. *Systema naturae per regna tria naturae*, Ed. 12, vol. 1 (2), pp. 533–1327, Holmiae.

LUNDBECK, W. 1907. *Diptera Danica*, Part 1, 166 pp. Copenhagen, London.

MAJER, J. 1977. Katonalegyek—gömblegyek, Stratiomyidae — Acroceridae. Diptera I. *Faun. Hungariae*, No. 129, vol. 5(10), pp. 1–75.

MÜLLER, O. F. 1776. *Zoologiae danicae Prodromus*. XXXII + 282 pp. Havnia.

NARTSHUK, E. P. 1969. Fam. Stratiomyidae *in Key to identification of insects of the European part of the U.S.S.R.*, vol. 5(1), pp. 454–481. Leningrad. (in Russian).

OLDROYD, H. 1969. Diptera Brachycera. Section (a). Tabanoidea and Asiloidea *in Handbook for the identification of British Insects*, vol. 9(4), 128 pp.

PONTOPPIDAN, E. 1763. *Den Danske Atlas*, vol. 1. Kjoebenhavn.

——— 1765. *Kurzgefasste Nachrichten, die Naturhistorie in Dänemark betreffend. Aus dem Dänischen übersetzt.*, vol.1(1), 232pp. Kopenhagen, Hamburg.

——— 1766. *Dänischer Atlas. Aus dem Dänischen übersetzt von J. A. Scheiben.*, vol.1(1), 464 pp. Kopenhagen, Hamburg.

ROZKOŠNÝ, R. 1983. *A biosystematic study of the European Stratiomyidae* (*Diptera*), vol. 2, 431 pp., Hague–Boston–London.

STACKELBERG, A. A. 1954. On the Diptera fauna of the Leningrad Region. II. Diptera, Brachycera. *Trudy̆. zool. Inst. Leningrad,* vol. 15, pp. 199–228. (in Russian).

TROJAN, P. 1963. Muchowki-Diptera. Zesz. 22. Stratiomyidae. *Klucze oznacz. owad. Polski,* No. 41, vol. 28(22), pp. 1–72.

ZIMINA, L. V. 1976. On the dipteran fauna of the U.S.S.R. Stratiomyidae. *Sb. trud. zool. Muz. MGU.*, vol. 15, pp. 117–135. (in Russian).

THE FAMILY NAMES FOR THE STORM PETRELS AND THE DIPPERS. Z.N.(S.)2024

By R. V. Melville (*93 Lock Road, Ham, Richmond, Surrey; formerly Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

In November 1972 an application was received from Dr G. N. Kashin (*Prospekt Vernadskogo No. 61, app. 53, Moscow 117415 U.S.S.R.*) pointing out that the family name HYDROBATIDAE Mathews, 1912, currently used for the storm petrels, is doubly invalid, as a junior homonym of HYDROBATIDAE Degland, 1849, for the dippers, and as a junior objective synonym of THALASSIDROMIDAE J. W. von Müller, 1865. Some authors also treat it as a junior subjective synonym of OCEANITIDAE Forbes, 1882, but this is not universally accepted. Dr Kashin wished to see THALASSIDROMIDAE suppressed and HYDROBATIDAE Mathews rejected, so that OCEANITIDAE would be placed on the Official List as the family name for the storm petrels and CINCLIDAE Sundevall, 1836 as the family name for the dippers.

2. The facts in this case are somewhat involved and have taken some time to collect. The two issues involved will be discussed separately.

The dippers

3. The valid generic name for the dippers is *Cinclus* Borkhausen, 1797, *Deutsche Fauna*, vol. 1, p. 300, type species, through *Cinclus hydrophilus* Borkhausen, 1797, *Sturnus cinclus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.*, ed. 10, p. 168. This genus is the type genus of the family CINCLIDAE Sundevall, 1836, *K. Vetensk. Akad. Handl.* for 1835, p. 91.

4. *Hydrobata* Vieillot, 1816, *Analyse d'une nouvelle ornithologie élémentaire*, p. 42, type species, by subsequent designation by G. R. Gray, 1841, *List of the genera of birds*, 2nd ed., p. 35, *Sturnus cinclus* Linnaeus, 1758, is a junior objective synonym of *Cinclus* Borkhausen, 1797. It is, however, the type genus of HYDROBATIDAE Degland, 1849, *Ornithologie européenne*, vol. 1, p. 445. As a junior objective synonym of CINCLIDAE Sundevall, 1836, HYDROBATIDAE cannot be used for the dippers; but it is available as a senior homonym of HYDROBATIDAE Mathews, 1912, which cannot therefore be used for the storm petrels.

5. From this analysis it is clear that the names currently used for the dippers are nomenclaturally valid and no intervention by the Commission is necessary.

The storm petrels

6. The oldest generic name for the storm petrels is *Hydrobates* Boie, 1822, *Isis* (Oken), 1822, col. 562, type species, by subsequent designation by Baird, Brewer & Ridgway, 1884, *Mem. Mus. comp. Zool. Harvard* vol. 13, p. 403, *Procellaria pelagica* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, p. 131. It is

the type genus of HYDROBATIDAE Mathews, 1912, *Birds of Australia*, vol. 2, pt 1, p. 9 which, as we have seen, is doubly invalid.

7. *Thalassidroma* Vigors, 1825, *Zool. J.* vol. 2, pt 7, p. 405, type species, by original designation, *Procellaria pelagica* Linnaeus, 1758, is a junior objective synonym of *Hydrobates* Boie, 1822. It is the type genus of THALASSIDROMIDAE J. W. von Müller, 1865, *Syst. Verz. Wirbelth. Mexicos* (Reise in den V.S., Canada und Mexico) vol. 3, pt 3, p. 594. As *Thalassidroma* was rejected long before 1961, THALASSIDROMIDAE is invalid under Article 40b and the date of HYDROBATIDAE Mathews is to be cited as '1912 (1865)'. Article 40 as a whole, however, deals only with the Principle of Priority and it does not follow that a date cited under its provisions is valid also for the purposes of the Principle of Homonymy.

8. *Oceanites* Keyserling & di Blasius, 1840, *Wirbelthiere Europas*, pp. xciii, 131, type species, by subsequent designation by G. R. Gray, 1841, *List of the genera of birds*, 2nd ed, p. 99, *Procellaria wilsoni* Bonaparte, 1824, *J. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, p. 231, is available for the long-legged storm petrels. The valid name for the type species is *Procellaria oceanica* Kuhl, 1820, *Beitr. Zool.* vol. 1, p. 136. It is the type genus of OCEANITIDAE Forbes, 1882, *Rep. sci. results Challenger*, Zool. vol. 4, pt 11, p. 3. Some ornithologists divide the HYDROBATIDAE into two subfamilies, HYDROBATINAE for the short-legged and OCEANITINAE for the long-legged storm petrels. This usage, however, is invalid because it inverts the priority of the two family-group names.

9. It is clear that the current usage of HYDROBATIDAE Mathews, 1912, can only be conserved if the plenary powers of the Commission are used, first, to suppress HYDROBATIDAE Degland, 1849 for the purposes of the Principle of Homonymy, and secondly, to give HYDROBATIDAE Mathews, 1912 nomenclatural precedence over OCEANITIDAE Forbes, 1881. The Commission is accordingly requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers:
   (a) to suppress the family name HYDROBATIDAE Degland, 1849 for the purposes of the Principle of Homonymy;
   (b) to rule that the family name HYDROBATIDAE Mathews, 1912 is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the family name OCEANITIDAE Forbes, 1882, by anyone who regards the two names as synonyms at the same rank in the family group;
(2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology:
   (a) *Hydrobates* Boie, 1822 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Baird, Brewer & Ridgway, 1884, *Procellaria pelagica* Linnaeus, 1758;
   (b) *Oceanites* Keyserling & di Blasius, 1840 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by G. R. Gray, 1841, *Procellaria wilsoni* Bonaparte, 1824;
(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:
   (a) *pelagica* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen

Procellaria pelagica (specific name of type species of *Hydrobates* Boie, 1822);
    (b) *oceanica* Kuhl, 1820, as published in the binomen *Procellaria oceanica* (the valid name at the time of this proposal for the type species of *Oceanites* Keyserling & di Blasius, 1840);
(4) to place on the Official List of Family–Group Names in Zoology:
    (a) HYDROBATIDAE Mathews, 1912 (1865) (type genus *Hydrobates* Boie, 1822), as validated under the plenary powers in (1) above, with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over OCEANITIDAE Forbes, 1882 whenever the two names are considered to be synonyms at the same rank in the family group;
    (b) OCEANITIDAE Forbes, 1882 (type genus *Oceanites* Keyserling & di Blasius, 1840) with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over HYDROBATIDAE Mathews, 1912 whenever the two names are considered to be synonyms at the same rank in the family group;
(5) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology:
    (a) *Hydrobata* Vieillot, 1816, a junior objective synonym of *Cinclus* Borkhausen, 1797;
    (b) *Thalassidroma* Vigors, 1825, a junior objective synonym of *Hydrobates* Boie, 1822;
(6) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology *hydrophilus* Borkhausen, 1797, as published in the binomen *Cinclus hydrophilus*, a junior objective synonym of *cinclus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Sturnus cinclus*;
(7) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology:
    (a) HYDROBATIDAE Degland, 1849, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1) above;
    (b) THALASSIDROMIDAE J. W. von Müller, 1865, invalid because the name of its type genus is a junior objective synonym rejected before 1961.

INDEX TO AUTHORS

Page
Achterberg, C. van 102

Bellinger, P.F. 201
Bauchot, M.L. 374
Ben-Tuvia, A. 374
Boulard, M. 211
Bradley, J.D. 9, 219
Branch, W.R. 89
Broadley, D.G. 89
Brothers, D.J. 382
Bruce, M.D. 50

Cifelli, R.L. 103
Cleevely, R.J. 64
Cokendopher, J.C. 10
Crosskey, R.W. 114, 209

Day, M.C. 385
Dolling, W.R. 293

Emery, A.R. 215

Fortuner, R. 62
Francke, O.F. 10

Griffiths, G.C.D. 101

Hadfield, M.G. 46
Hamilton, C.J. 9
Hamilton, K.G.A. 123, 211
Harvey, M.S. 85
Heemstra, P.C. 374
Hewitt, G.C. 387
Hodges, R.W. 8
Holthuis, L.B. 219, 304
Holyoak, D.T. 50
Howden, A.T. 296

Jelnes, J.E. 60
Jones, J.B. 57

Keen, A.M. 46
Kerzhner, I.M. 109
Kullander, S.O. 215

Lane, P.D. 379
Lauterer, P. 214
Lehtinen, P.T. 389
Levi, H.W. 81

Mahnert, V. 85
Manning, R.B. 304
McCune, A.R. 371
Melville, R.V.
10, 72, 74, 76, 197, 199, 200, 329, 398
Miller, W.E. 8
Millidge, A.F. 91
Mound, L.A. 382
Mroczkowski, M. 391

Nartshuk, E.P. 393, 395
Norton, R.A. 84

O'Hara, J.E. 93

Quintero, D. Jr. 10

Raastad, J.E. 113
Randall, J.E. 374
Ratcliffe, B.C. 209
Raven, J.G.M. 79
Ride, W.D.L. 327
Rogin, L. de 302
Rosen, D. 214
Rousset, V. 387
Roskošný, R. 393, 395

Sattler, K. 219
Seaton, R.W. 306
Soria, M.F. 106
Speidel, W. 7
Stimson, A.F. 6

Taylor, W.R. 14
Thibaut, J.-C. 50
Tremewan, W.G. 9
Tuck, K. 9

Vockeroth, J.R. 123, 209

Wake, M.H. 220
Weber, C. 302
Wharton, R. 102
Wright, C.W. 12, 64

Zwick, H. 111

LIST OF DECISIONS IN THIS VOLUME

Opinion *Page*
1288 *Sphinx tipuliformis* Clerck, 1759 (Insecta, Lepidoptera): conserved 17
1289 *Mesoplodon* Gervais, 1850 (Mammalia, Cetacea): conserved . . 19
1290 *Leptinotarsa* Chevrolat, 1837 (Insecta, Coleoptera): conserved . . 21
1291 *Antilope zebra* Gray, 1838 (Mammalia): conserved. 24
1292 *Voluta papilio* Link, 1807 (Gastropoda): conserved 27
1293 *Scolia quinquecincta* Fabricius, 1793 is the type species of *Heterelis* Costa, 1887 (Insecta, Hymenoptera) 29
1294 *Edwardsia* De Quatrefages, 1841 (Coelenterata, Actiniaria): conserved 31
1295 *Actinia* Linnaeus, 1767 and ACTINIIDAE Rafinesque, 1815 (Coelenterata, Actiniaria) and *Pentacta* Goldfuss, 1820 (Echinodermata, Holothurioidea): conserved 34
1296 Request for the use of the plenary powers to conserve *Nettastomella* Carpenter, 1865 (Bivalvia): refused 37
1297 *Xenocrepis pura* Mayr, 1904 (designated as type species of *Xenocrepis* Foerster, 1856 (Insecta, Hymenoptera). 39
1298 *Tyrophagus* Oudemans, 1924 (Acarina): clarification of name of type species and conservation. 124
1299 *Athyreus* Macleay, 1819 and *Glyptus* Brullé, 1835 (Insecta, Coleoptera): conserved 128
1300 TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 given nomenclatural precedence over AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826 (Reptilia, Sauria) 130
1301 *Artemia* Leach, 1819 (Crustacea, Branchiopoda): conserved . . 134
1302 *Nabis capsiformis* Germar, [1838] (Insecta, Heteroptera, Nabidae): conserved 137
1303 *Coccus* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Parthenolecanium* Šulc, 1908 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Homoptera): type species designated 139
1304 *Melithaea* Milne Edwards & Haime, 1857 and *Isis ochracea* Linnaeus 1758 (Coelenterata, Anthozoa): conserved 142
1305 *Bapta candidaria* Leech, 1897 is the type species of *Lamprocabera*, 1958 Inoue, 1958 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) 144
1306 *Ledella bushae* Warén, 1978 is the type species of *Ledella* Verrill & Bush, 1897 (Mollusca, Bivalvia) 146
1307 *Ptinella* Motschulsky, 1844 and *Nephanes* Thomson, 1859 (Insecta, Coleoptera): conserved. 148
1308 *Aphis callunae* Theobald, 1915 (Insecta, Hemiptera): conserved . 150
1309 *Geoemyda* Gray, 1834 and *Rhinoclemmys* Fitzinger, 1835 (Reptilia, Testudines): conserved 152
1310 *Eutermes exitiosus* Hill, 1925 (Insecta, Isoptera): conserved . . . 154
1311 *Corisella* Lundblad, 1928 and *Krizousacorixa* Hungerford, 1930 (Insecta, Heteroptera): conserved 156
1312 *Heliothis* Ochsenheimer, 1816 (Insecta, Lepidoptera): gender and stem designated 159
1313 *Testudo scripta* Schoepff, 1792 and *Emys cataspila* Günther, 1885 (Reptilia, Testudines): conserved 160
1314 *Hydrophorus nebulosus* Fallén, 1823, is the type species of *Hydrophorus* Fallén, 1823 (Insecta, Diptera). 162

1315 *Eolis alderi* Cocks, 1852 is the type species of *Aeolidiella* Bergh, 1867 (Mollusca, Gastropoda) 165
1316 *Globigerina cerroazulensis* Cole, 1928 (Foraminifera): conserved . 167
1317 *Tupus* Sellards, 1906 (Insecta, Protodonata): conserved 169
1318 (Opinion correcting the ruling given in Opinion 92): *Lacerta velox* Pallas, 1771 is the type species of *Eremias* Wiegmann, 1834 (Reptilia) 171
1319 *Nomioides* Schenck, 1866 (Insecta, Hymenoptera): designation of type species 173
1320 *Hydrodamalis* Retzius, 1794 and *Manatus inunguis* Natterer in Pelzeln, 1883 (Mammalia, Sirenia): conserved 175
1321 Grant of nomenclatural precedence to EPHYDRIDAE Zetterstedt, 1837 over HYDRELLIIDAE Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Insecta, Diptera) 177
1322 *Buprestis nana* Paykull, 1799, non Gmelin, 1790 (Insecta, Coleoptera): conserved 180
1323 *Byrrhus semistriatus* Fabricius, 1794 (Insecta, Coleoptera): conserved 182
1324 *Diademodon* Seeley, 1894 and *Diademodon tetragonus* Seeley, 1894 conserved by the suppression of *Cynochampsa* Owen, 1859 and *Cynochampsa laniaria* Owen, 1859 (Reptilia, Therapsida) . . . 185
1325 *Capsus ater* Jakovlev, 1889 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Heteroptera): not rejected as a junior homonym of *Cimex ater* Linnaeus, 1758. . . 188
1326 *Cimex quadripunctatus* Fabricius, 1794 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Heteroptera): conserved 190
1327 *Holocentropus* McLachlan, 1878 (Insecta, Trichoptera): conserved 192
1328 *Belemnites mucronatus* Schlotheim, 1813 (Coleoidea): conserved and neotype designated 222
1329 *Galago crassicaudatus* E. Geoffroy, 1812 (Primates, Galigidae): neotype designated 226
1330 *Prodorylaimus* Andrassy, 1959 (Nematoda): type species designated 228
1331 SPHAERIIDAE Jeffreys, 1862 (1820) (Mollusca, Bivalvia) and MICROSPORIDAE Reichardt, 1976 (Insecta, Coleoptera): placed on the Official List 230
1332 *Calamoecia australica* Sars, 1908 and *Calamoecia australis* (Searle, 1911) (Crustacea, Copepoda): proposals to remove the confusion rejected 233
1333 *Ipnops murrayi* Günther, 1878 (Ostiechthyes): conserved 236
1334 *Harminius* Fairmaire, 1851 (Coleoptera): type species designated . 238
1335 *Nepa cinerea* Linnaeus, 1758 (Insecta, Heteroptera): conserved. . 241
1336 Five specific names proposed as new for the genus *Heterodera* A. Schmidt, 1871 (Aschelminthes, Nematoda) by B.A. Cooper, 1955 ruled to be available. 244
1337 *Selkirkia columbia* Conway Morris, 1977 designated as type species of *Selkirkia* Walcott, 1911 (Priapulida) 249
1338 *Thrips rufus* Haliday, 1836 (Insecta, Thysanoptera): conserved for the type species of *Aptinothrips* Haliday, 1836 251
1339 *Papilio fatima* Fabricius, 1793 (Insecta, Lepidoptera): ruled to be exempt from the application of the Principle of Homonymy. . . 255

1340 *Attus otiosus* Hentz, 1846 (Arachnida, Araneae): conserved . . . 258
1341 *Simulium amazonicum* Goeldi, 1905 (Insecta, Diptera): neotype designated . . . 261
1342 *Damalis planiceps* Fabricius, 1805 designated as type species of *Damalis* Fabricius, 1805 (Insecta, Diptera) . . . 264
1343 *Kinosternon alamosae* Berry & Legler, 1980 and *Kinosternon oaxacae* Berry & Iverson, 1980 (Reptilia, Testudines): conserved . . . 266
1344 *Mayorella* Schaeffer, 1926 given nomenclatural precedence over *Dactylamoeba* Korotneff, 1880 (Rhizopoda, Amoebida) . . . 269
1345 *Laomedea flexuosa* Alder, 1857, *Sertularia volubilis* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Campanularia johnstoni* Alder, 1856 designated as type species of *Laomedea* Lamouroux, 1812, *Campanularia* Lamarck, 1816 and *Clytia* Lamouroux, 1812 (Coelenterata, Hydroida) respectively . 271
1346 *Cythereis distinguenda* Neviana, 1928, *Cythere crispata* Brady, 1868 and *Cythere pavonia* Brady, 1866 (Crustacea, Ostracoda): type material conserved . . . 274
1347 *Anthalia schoenherri* Zetterstedt, 1838 designated as type species of *Anthalia* Zetterstedt, 1838 (Insecta, Diptera) . . . 277
1348 *Bos gaurus* H. Smith, 1827 (Mammalia, Artiodactyla): conserved . 279
1349 *Antilope depressicornis* H. Smith, 1827 and *Anoa quarlesi* Ouwens, 1910 (Mammalia, Artiodactyla): conserved . . . 281
1350 *Conus antiquus* Lamarck, 1810 (Mollusca, Gastropoda): neotype suppressed . . . 283
1351 *Galeopsomyia* Girault, 1916 (Insecta, Hymenoptera): conserved . 285
1352 *Eurhinus* Schönherr, 1825 (Insecta, Coleoptera): ruled as a justified emendation of *Eurhin* Illiger, 1807 . . . 287
1353 *Myzus festucae* Theobald, 1917 (Insecta, Hemiptera): conserved . 291
1354 *Agrotis redimicula* Morrison, 1874 (Lepidoptera): conserved from 1874 . . . 330
1355 *Lingula anatina* Lamarck, 1801 is the type species of *Lingula* Bruguière, [1797] (Brachiopoda) . . . 332
1356 *Dactylopusia* Norman, 1903 (Crustacea, Copepoda): type species designated . . . 335
1357 ANUROPODIDAE Bacescu, 1980 (Crustacea, Tanaidacea) and ANUROPODIDAE Stebbing, 1893 (Crustacea, Isopoda): a ruling to remove the anomaly . . . 338
1358 *Calaphis* Walsh, 1862 and *Callaphis* Walker, 1870 (Insecta, Hemiptera): a ruling to remove the confusion . . . 341
1359 UROPLAT—as the stem of family-group names in Reptilia, Sauria and Insecta, Coleoptera: a ruling to remove the homonymy 344
1360 *Oeciacus vicarius* Horváth, 1912 (Insecta, Hemiptera): conserved . 347
1361 *Larentia capitata* Herrich-Schaeffer, 1839, given nomenclatural precedence over *Phalaena posticata* Fabricius, 1794 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) . . . 349
1362 *Phalaena coracina* Esper, 1805, given nomenclatural precedence over *Phalaena hirtata* Fabricius, 1794 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) . . 351
1363 *Ancistroceroides* Saussure, 1855 (Insecta, Hymenoptera): type species designated . . . 353
1364 *Kassina* Girard, 1853 (Amphibia, Anura): conserved (see Opinion 849) . . . 355

1365 *Allygus* Fieber, 1872 (Insecta, Homoptera): type species designated 357
1366 *Mactra sachalinensis* Schrenk, 1862 (Mollusca, Bivalvia): conserved 359
1367 *Alpheus lottini* Guérin, 1829 (Crustacea, Decapoda): conserved . 361
1368 The generic names *Pan* and *Panthera* (Mammalia, Carnivora): available as from Oken, 1816 365

Direction

116 PAPILIONIDAE Latreille, [1802] (Insecta, Lepidoptera): revision of Official List entry 41
117 Correction of Entry No 462 in the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology concerning *Sphaerium* Scopoli, 1777 (Mollusca, Bivalvia) (correction to Opinion 94) 43
118 Corrections to three entries in the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology: ARGYNNIDAE, APATURIDAE, LIMENITIDINAE (Insecta, Lepidoptera) 195

NAMES PLACED ON OFFICIAL LISTS AND INDEXES IN DECISIONS PUBLISHED IN VOLUME 42

Official List of Specific Names in Zoology

alamosae, Kinosternon, Berry & Legler, 1980
alastoroides, Odynerus, Saussure, 1853
albida, Eulimene, Latreille, 1816
alderi, Eolis, Cocks, 1852
amazonicum, Simulium, Goeldi, 1905
ameiva, Lacerta, Linnaeus, 1758
anatina, Lingula, Lamarck, 1801
antiquus, Conus, Lamarck, 1810
apterum, Ptilium, Guérin-Méneville, 1839
arguta, Lacerta, Pallas, 1773
ater, Capsus, Jakovlev, 1889
ater, Cimex, Linnaeus, 1758
atomaria, Cicada, Fabricius, 1794
australica, Calamoecia, Sars, 1908
australis, Brunella, Searle, 1911
beautempsii, Edwardsia, de Quatrefages, 1842
betulella, Calaphis, Walsh, 1862
betulina, Aphis, Walker, 1852
bidens, Physeter, Sowerby, 1804
bifenestra, Heterodera, Cooper, 1955
bifurcatus, Athyreus, Macleay, 1819
bigemma, Amoeba, Schaeffer, 1918
branchiatus, Anuropus, Beddard, 1886
bushae, Ledella, Warén, 1978
callunae, Aphis, Theobald, 1915
candidaria, Bapta, Leech, 1897
capitata, Larentia, Herrich-Schäffer, 1839
capsiformis, Nabis, Germar, [1838]
cataspila, Emys, Günther, 1885
cerroazulensis, Globigerina, Cole, 1928
cinerea, Nepa, Linnaeus, 1758
columbia, Selkirkia, Conway Morris, 1977
columbianus, Euderus, Ashmead, 1888
coracina, Phalaena, Esper, 1805
corni, Lecanium, Bouché, 1844
crassicaudatus, Galago, E. Geoffroy, 1812
crispata, Cythere, Brady, 1868
cupratus, Eurhinus, Illiger, 1807
darwinii, Pholas, G.B. Sowerby II, 1849
depressicornis, Antilope, H. Smith, 1827
dipsacea, Phalaena, Linnaeus, 1767
distinguenda, Cythereis, Neviana, 1928
doliolum, Actinia, Pallas, 1766
doria, Antilope, Ogilby, 1837
dubius, Philopotamus, Rambur, 1842
elongata, Dactylamoeba, Korotneff, 1880
equinus, Priapus, Linnaeus, 1758
exitiosus, Eutermes, Hill, 1925
fatima, Papilio, Fabricius, 1793
femorata, Corixa, Guérin-Méneville, 1857
festucae, Myzus, Theobald, 1917
fimbriatus, Stellio, Schneider, 1792
flaviceps, Notiphila, Meigen, 1830
flexuosa, Laomedea, Alder, 1857
francispori, Anuropoda, Bacescu, 1980
gaurus, Bos, H. Smith, 1827
gigas, Manati, Zimmermann, 1780
hesperidum, Coccus, Linnaeus, 1758
heydenii, Leptinotarsa, Stål, 1858
hirtata, Phalaena, Fabricius, 1794
inunguis, Manatus, Natterer in Pelzeln, 1883
johnstoni, Campanularia, Alder, 1856
juglandis, Aphis, Goeze, 1778
lanceolatus, Belemnites, Schlotheim, 1813
leucostoma, Voluta, Gmelin, 1791
limonii, Heterodera, Cooper, 1955
longicaudatoides, Prodorylaimus, Alther, 1968
longior, Tyroglyphus, Gervais, 1844
lottini, Alpheus, Guérin, 1829
lucida, Yoldia, Lovén, 1846
maculatus, Hylambates, Duméril, 1853
mercenaria, Corixia, Say, 1832
methwoldensis, Heterodera, Cooper, 1955
minutissima, Apis, Rossi, 1790

mixta, Cicada, Fabricius, 1794
morys, Pteromalus, Walker, 1848
mucronata, Hispa, Olivier, 1808
mucronatus, Belemnites, Schlotheim, 1813
murrayi, Ipnops, Günther, 1878
myrmecophilum, Macrosiphum, Theobald, 1916
nana, Buprestis, Paykull, 1799
nebulosus, Hydrophorus, Fallén, 1823
oaxacae, Kinosternon, Berry & Iverson, 1980
obsidianus, Microsporus, Kolenati, 1846
ochracea, Isis, Linnaeus, 1758
otiosus, Attus, Hentz, 1846
papilio, Voluta, Link, 1807
pardus, Felis, Linnaeus, 1758
pavonia, Cythere, Brady, 1866
permianus, Tupus, Sellards, 1906
picipes, Byrrhus, Olivier, 1790
planiceps, Damalis, Fabricius, 1805
polygoni, Heterodera, Cooper, 1955
posticata, Phalaena, Fabricius, 1794
putrescentiae, Acarus, Schrank, 1781
quadripunctatus, Lygaeus, Fabricius, 1794
quarlesi, Anoa, Ouwens, 1910
quinquecincta, Scolia, Fabricius, 1793
redimicula, Agrotis, Morrison, 1874
riparia, Ephydra, Fallén, 1813
rubra, Nepa, Linnaeus, 1758
rufipes, Byrrhus, Kugelann, 1792
rufus, Thrips (Aptinothrips) rufa, Haliday, 1836
sachalinensis, Mactra, Schrenk, 1862
salinus, Cancer, Linnaeus, 1758
scabrior, Eurhinus, Kirby, 1819
schoenherri, Anthalia, Zetterstedt, 1838
scripta, Testudo, Schoeff, 1792
sculptilis, Glyptus, Brullé, 1835
semistriatus, Byrrhus, Fabricius, 1794
spengleri, Testudo, Gmelin, 1789
spiniger, Athous, Candèze, 1860
stroemii, Cyclops, Baird, 1837
teguixin, Lacerta, Linnaeus, 1758
tetragonus, Diademodon, Seeley, 1894
teyou, Lacerta, Daudin, 1802
tiliae, Coccus, Linnaeus, 1758
tipuliformis, Sphinx, Clerck, 1759
tisboides, Dactylopus, Claus, 1863
titan, Trichopteryx, Newman, 1834
tricolor, Encarsia, Foerster, 1878
troglodytes, Simia, Blumenbach, 1779
tropicalis, Globigerina, Blow & Banner, 1962
urticae, Heterodera, Cooper, 1955
velox, Lacerta, Pallas, 1771
vetusta, Phryganeolitha, Germar, 1813
vicarius, Oeciacus, Horváth, 1912
volubilis, Sertularia, Linnaeus, 1758
zebra, Antilope, Gray, 1838

Official List of Generic Names in Zoology

Actinia Linnaeus, 1767
Aeolidiella Bergh, 1867
Allygidius Ribaut, 1948
Allygus Fieber, 1872
Ameiva Meyer, 1795
Ancistroceroides Saussure, 1855
Anthalia Zetterstedt, 1838
Anuropoda Bacescu, 1980
Anuropus Beddard, 1886
Aptinothrips Haliday, 1836
Artemia Leach, 1819
Athyreus Macleay, 1819
Belemnella Nowak, 1913
Belemnitella d'Orbigny, 1840
Calaphis Walsh, 1862
Campanularia Lamarck, 1816
Clytia Lamouroux, 1812
Coccus Linnaeus, 1758
Corisella Lundblad, 1928
Dactylamoeba Korotneff, 1880
Dactylopusia Norman, 1903
Damalis Fabricius, 1805
Diademodon Seeley, 1894
Edwardsia de Quatrefages, 1841
Encarsia Foerster, 1878
Ephydra Fallén, 1810

Eremias Wiegmann, 1834
Eulecanium Cockerell, 1893
Eulimene Latreille, 1816
Eurhinus Illiger, 1807
Eurhynchus Kirby, in Kirby & Spence, 1828
Galeopsomyia Girault, 1916
Geoemyda Gray, 1834
Glyptus Brullé, 1835
Harminius Fairmaire, 1851
Heliothis Ochsenheimer, 1816
Heterelis Costa, 1887
Heterolaophonte Lang, 1948
Holocentropus McLachlan, 1878
Hydrellia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830
Hydrodamalis Retzius, 1794
Hydrophorus Fallén, 1823
Hylambates Duméril, 1853
Ipnops Günther, 1878
Krizousacorixa Hungerford, 1930
Lamprocabera Inoue, 1958
Laomedea Lamouroux, 1812
Ledella Verrill & Bush, 1897
Leptinotarsa Chevrolat, 1837
Lingula Bruguière, [1797]
Mayorella Schaeffer, 1926
Melithaea Edwards & Haime, 1857
Mesoplodon Gervais, 1850
Microsporus Kolenati, 1846
Nephanes Thomson, 1859
Netastoma Carpenter, 1864
Nomioides Schenck, 1866
Ommateremias Lantz, 1928
Pan Oken, 1816
Panaphis Kirkaldy, 1904
Panthera Oken, 1816
Parthenolecanium Šulc, 1908
Pentacta Goldfuss, 1820
Phryganeolitha Germar, 1813
Prodorylaimus Andrassy, 1959
Ptinella Motschulsky, 1844
Rhinoclemmys Fitzinger, 1835
Selkirkia Walcott, 1911
Simplocaria Stephens, 1829
Teius Merrem, 1820
Tupinambis Daudin, 1802
Tyrophagus Oudemans, 1924
Uroplata Chevrolat, 1835
Uroplatus Duméril, 1806
Xenocrepis Foerster, 1856
Yoldiella Verrill & Bush, 1897

Official List of Family Group Names in Zoology

ACTINIIDAE Rafinesque, 1815
AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826
ANUROPIDAE Stebbing, 1893
ANUROPODIDAE Bacescu, 1980
APATURIDAE Boisduval, 1840
ARGYNNIDAE Duponchel, [1835] (in Godard, J.B.)
BELEMNITELLIDAE Pavlow, 1914
CALAPHIDINI Oestlund, 1918
DACTYLOPUSIINAE Lang, 1936
EDWARDSIIDAE Andres, 1881
EPHYDRIDAE Zetterstedt, 1837
EURHININI Lacordaire, 1866
EURHYNCHINAE Lacordaire, 1863
HELIOTHINAE (ex Heliothidi) Boisduval, 1828
HYDRELLIIDAE Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830
HYDROPHORINAE Lioy, 1864 (or Schiner, 1864)
IPNOPIDAE Jordan, 1923
LIMENITIDINAE Butler, [12 February 1870]
MICROSPORIDAE Reichardt, 1976
PANAPHIDINI Oestlund, 1922
PAPILIONIDE Latreille [1802]
SPHAERIIDAE Jeffreys, 1862
TEIIDAE Gray, 1827
TYROPHAGIDAE Oudemans, 1924
UROPLATIIDAE Boulenger, 1884
UROPLATINI Leng, 1920

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology

alamose, Kinosternon, Pritchard, 1979
angustus, Nabis, Spinola, 1837
anoa, Bos bubalus, Kerr, 1792
applanata, Globigerina, Hantken, 1883
australis, Termes, Walker, 1853
coryli, Coccus, Linnaeus, 1758
dimidiatus, Acarus, Hermann, 1804
exunguis, Manatus, Natterer in Diesing, 1839
globosa, Globigerina, Hantken, 1883
guavera, Bos bubalus, Kerr, 1792
laniaria, Cynochampsa, Owen, 1859
lingua, Mytilus, Lightfoot, 1786
lunifrontis, Cimex, Cooper, 1870
mirabilis, Lychnoculus, Murray, 1877
nana, Buprestis, Gmelin, 1790
oaxacae, Kinosternon, Pritchard, 1979
ocracea, Isis, Linnaeus, 1758
pulcher, Attus, Walckenaer, 1837
pulcher pallida, Attus, Walckenaer, 1837
peregrinus, Attus, Walckenaer, 1837
quadripunctatus, Cimex, Villers, 1789
redimacula, Agrotis, Morrison, 1874
salmachus, Sphinx, Linnaeus, 1758
soemmeringii, Aeolidiella, Bergh, 1882
soemmerringii, Eolida, Leuckart, 1828
sublucanus, Cancer, Forskål, 1775
sybillae, Mactra, Valenciennes, 1858
ventricosa, Emys, Gray, 1855
zebrata, Antilope, Robert, 1836

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology

Actinia Pallas, 1766
Ahuautlea de la Llave, 1832
Artemisia Latreille, 1816
Artemisus Lamarck, 1818
Callaphis Walker, 1870
Chemelys Rafinesque, 1832
Cyclas Lamarck, [1798]
Cynochampsa Owen, 1859
Edwardsia de Costa, 1834
Eremiophilus Fitzinger, 1843
Eurhin Illiger, 1807
Eurhynchus Berthold, 1827
Glyptus Hoffmannsegg, 1818
Lecanium Burmeister, 1835
Lychnoculus Murray, 1877
Manati Steller, 1774
Melitea Lamouroux, 1812
Melitodes Verrill, 1864
Micropteron Eschricht, 1849
Mikropteron Eschricht, 1849
Nodus Wagler, 1830
Polygramma Chevrolat, 1837
Priapus Linnaeus, 1758
Pseudocorymbites Fiori, 1898
Sphaerius Waltl, 1838
Titan Matthews, 1858
Trichaporus Foerster, 1856
Trichoporus Ashmead, 1900
Typus Sellards, 1909

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family Group Names in Zoology

ANUROPODINAE Stebbing, 1893
CALLAPHIDINAE Börner, 1952
CYCLADIDAE Rafinesque, 1820
DACTYLOPODIINAE Lang, 1936
PAPILIONIDES Latreille, [1802]
SPHAERIIDAE Erichson, 1845
TUPINAMBIDAE Gray, 1825
TYPIDAE Handlirsch, 1919

INDEX TO KEY NAMES

Page
abbreviatella, Trichopteryx, Heer, 1841 (Opinion 1307) 148
Actia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 93
Actinia Linnaeus, 1767 (Opinion 1295). 34
Actinia Pallas, 1766 (Opinion 1295). 34
ACTINIIDAE Rafinesque, 1815 (Opinion 1295) 34
Adelura Foerster, 1862 102
Aeolidiella Bergh, 1867 (Opinion 1315) 165
Ahuautlea de la Llave, 1832 (Opinion 1311) 156
alamosae, Kinosternon, Berry & Legler, 1980 (Opinion 1343) . . . 266
alamose, Kinosternon, Pritchard, 1979 (Opinion 1343). 266
alastoroides, Odynerus, Saussure, 1853 (Opinion 1363) 353
albida, Eulimene, Latreille, 1816 (Opinion 1301). 134
alderi, Eolis, Cocks, 1852 (Opinion 1315) 165
Allygidius Ribaud, 1948 (Opinion 1365) 357
Allygus Fieber, 1872 (Opinion 1365) 357
amazonicum, Simulium, Goeldi, 1905 (Opinion 1341) 261
ameiva, Lacerta, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1300) 130
Ameiva Meyer, 1795 (Opinion 1300) 130
AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826 (Opinion 1300) 130
ammonitiformis, Stoa, De Serres, 1855 48
anatina, Lingula, Lamarck, 1801 (Opinion 1355) 332
Ancistroceroides Saussure, 1855 (Opinion 1363). 353
angustus, Nabis, Spinola, 1837 (Opinion 1302) 137
Anoplocephala Blanchard, 1848 76
Anoplocephala Stål, 1870 77
Anthalia Zetterstedt, 1838 (Opinion 1347). 277
anthyllidis, Zygaena, Boisduval, [1828] 10
antiquus, Conus, Lamarck, 1810 (Opinion 1350). 283
ANUROPIDAE Stebbing, 1893 (Opinion 1357) 338
Anuropoda Bacescu, 1980 (Opinion 1357) 338
ANUROPODIDAE Bacescu, 1980 (Opinion 1357) 338
ANUROPODIDAE Stebbing, 1893 (Opinion 1357) 338
Anuropus Beddard, 1886 (Opinion 1357) 338
APATURIDAE Boisduval, 1840 (Direction 118) 195
applanata, Globigerina, Hantken, 1883 (Opinion 1316) 167
apterum, Ptilium, Guérin-Méneville, 1839 (Opinion 1307) 148
Aptinothrips Haliday, 1836 (Opinion 1338) 251
arborea, Oribata, Jacot, 1931 54
argus, Anthias, Bloch, 1792 374
argus, Cephalopholis, Schneider, 1801 374
arguta, Lacerta, Pallas, 1773 (Opinion 1318) 171
ARGYNNIDAE Duponchel, [1835] (in Godart, J.B.) (Direction 118) 195
argyreatum, Simulium, Meigen, 1838 115
Argyrodes Guénée, 1845 81
Argyrodes Simon, 1864 81
argyrodes, Linyphia, Walckenaer, 1841 83

Artemesia Latreille, 1816 (Opinion 1301) 134
Artemia Leach, 1819 (Opinion 1301) 134
Artemisus Lamarck, 1818 (Opinion 1301) 134
ater, Capsus, Jakovlev, 1889 (Opinion 1325) 188
ater, Cimex, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1325) 188
Athyreus Macleay, 1819 (Opinion 1299) 128
atomaria, Cicada, Fabricius, 1794 (Opinion 1365) 357
aurifacies, Hydrellia, Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Opinion 1321) 177
aurorae, Carpophaga, Peale, 1848 50
australica, Calamoecia, Sars, 1908 (Opinion 1332) 233
australis, Calamoecia (Searle, 1911) (Opinion 1332) 233
australis, Termes, Walker, 1853 (Opinion 1310) 154
AUSTROCHILIDAE Zapfe, 1955 389
Austrochilus Gertsch, in Zapfe, 1955 389

Bagrus Bosc, 1816 14
Bagre Cloquet, 1816 14
BAGRIDAE Bleeker, 1858 15
beautempsii, Edwardsia, de Quatrefages, 1842 (Opinion 1294) 31
Belemnella Nowak, 1913 (Opinion 1328) 222
Belemnitella d'Orbigny, 1840 (Opinion 1328) 222
bergeri, Semionotus, Agassiz, 1833 371
Berytus Fabricius, 1803 293
betulella, Calaphis, Walsh, 1862 (Opinion 1358) 341
betulina, Aphis, Walker, 1852 (Opinion 1308) 150
bidens, Physeter, Sowerby, 1804 (Opinion 1289) 19
bifenestra, Heterodera, Cooper, 1955 (Opinion 1336) 244
bifurcatus, Athyreus, Macleay, 1819 (Opinion 1299) 128
bigemma, Amoeba, Schaeffer, 1918 (Opinion 1344) 269
bilamellatus, Clausilia (Strobilus), Anton, 1839 199
bimaculatus, Drasterius, (Rossi, 1790) 391
bimaculatus, Elater, Fourcroy, 1785 391
Brachyderes Schönherr, 1823 296
BRACHYDERINAE Schönherr, 1826 299
branchiatus, Anuropus, Beddard, 1886 (Opinion 1357) 338
bubalus anoa, Bos, Kerr, 1792 (Opinion 1349) 281
bucatus, Adianthus, Ameghino, 1891 103
bushae, Ledella, Warén, 1978 (Opinion 1306) 146

CALAPHIDINI Oestlund, 1918 (Opinion 1358) 341
Calaphis Walsh, 1862 (Opinion 1358) 341
CALLAPHIDINAE Börner, 1952 (Opinion 1358) 341
Callaphis Walker, 1870 (Opinion 1358) 341
callida, Dorippe, Fabricius, 1798 305
callunae, Aphis, Theobald, 1915 (Opinion 1308) 150
Campanularia, Lamarck, 1816 (Opinion 1345) 271
candida, Folsomia, Willem, 1902 201
candidaria, Bapta, Leech, 1897 (Opinion 1305) 144
capensis, Algyra, A. Smith, 1838 90
capitata, Larentia, Herrich-Schäffer, 1839 (Opinion 1361) 249

capsiformis, Nabis, Germar, [1838] (Opinion 1302) 137
catarractus, Cycloderes, Sahlberg, 1823 299
cataspila, Emys, Günther, 1885 (Opinion 1313) 160
cavicola, Entomobrya, Banks, 1897 201
Cheirurus Beyrich, 1845 379
Chemelys Rafinesque, 1832 (Opinion 1309) 152
Chimpansee Voigt, 1831 (Opinion 1369) 366
Chromis Cuvier, 1814 215
Chrysomyia Macquart, 1834 393
cinerea, Nepa, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1335) 241
cingulata, Acta, Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 96
citrophilus, Radopholus, Huettel, Dickson & Caplan, 1984 62
clausa, Tornatellina, Pfeiffer, 1842 199
clavipes, Cimex, Fabricius, 1775 293
Clytia Lamouroux, 1812 (Opinion 1345) 271
Cnetha Enderlein, 1921 121
Coccus Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1303) 139
columbia, Selkirkia, Conway Morris, 1977 (Opinion 1337) 249
columbianus, Euderus, Ashmead, 1888 (Opinion 1351) 285
conocephali, Cryptothrips, Karny, 1913 382
coracina, Phalaena, Esper, 1805 (Opinion 1362) 351
Corisella Lundblad, 1928 (Opinion 1311) 156
cornea, Tellina, Linnaeus, 1758 (Direction 117) 43
corni, Lecanium, Bouché, 1844 (Opinion 1303) 139
coryli, Coccus, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1303) 139
crassicaudatus, Galago, E. Geoffroy, 1812 (Opinion 1329) 226
crispata, Cythere, Brady, 1868 (Opinion 1346) 274
Ctenium Menge, 1871 81
cupratus, Eurhinus, Illiger, 1807 (Opinion 1352) 287
CYCLADIDAE Rafinesque, 1820 (Direction 117) 43
Cyclas Lamarck, [1798] (Direction 117) 43
Cycloderes Sahlberg, 1823 296
Cycloderes Schönherr, 1823 296
Cydia Hübner, [1825] 8
Cynochampsa Owen, 1859 (Opinion 1324) 185

Dactylamoeba Korotneff, 1880 (Opinion 1344) 269
DACTYLOPODIINAE Lang, 1936 (Opinion 1356) 335
Dactylopusia Norman, 1903 (Opinion 1356) 335
DACTYLOPUSIINAE Lang, 1936 (Opinion 1356) 335
Damalis Fabricius, 1805 (Opinion 1342) 264
Dapsilarthra Foerster, 1862 101
darwinii, Pholas, G.B. Sowerby II, 1849 (Opinion 1296) 37
Dendropoma Mörch, 1861 48
depressicornis, Antilope, H. Smith, 1827 (Opinion 1349) 281
Diademodon Seeley, 1894 (Opinion 1324) 185
dimidiatus, Acarus, Hermann, 1804 (Opinion 1298) 124
diminuta, Taenia, Rudolphi, 1819 73
dipsacea, Phalaena, Linnaeus, 1767 (Opinion 1312) 158
distinguenda, Cythereis, Neviana, 1928 (Opinion 1346) 274
doliolum, Actinia, Pallas, 1766 (Opinion 1295) 34

doria, Antilope, Ogilby, 1837 (Opinion 1291) 24
Dorippoides Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969 305
dorsata, Testudo, Schoepff, 1801 (Opinion 1309) 152
dubius, Philopotamus, Rambur, 1842 (Opinion 1327) 192

Echinococcus Rudolphi, 1801 74
Edwardsia de Costa, 1834 (Opinion 1294) 31
Edwardsia de Quatrefages, 1841 (Opinion 1294) 31
EDWARDSIIDAE Andres, 1881 (Opinion 1294) 31
Elfia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 96
elongata, Dactylamoeba, Korotneff, 1880 (Opinion 1344) 269
Ephydra Fallén, 1810 (Opinion 1321) 177
EPHYDRIDAE Zetterstedt, 1837 (Opinion 1321) 177
equina, Taenia, Pallas, 1781 76
equinus, Priapus, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1295) 34
erebus, Zygaena, Meigen, 1829 10
Eremias Wiegmann, 1834 (Opinion 1318) 171
Eremiophilus Fitzinger, 1843 (Opinion 1364) 355
Erigone Audouin, 1826 91
Eucarpia Hübner, [1825] 83
Eugynothrips Priesner, 1926 382
Eulecanium Cockerell, 1893 (Opinion 1303) 139
Eulimene Latreille, 1816 (Opinion 1301) 134
Eurhin Illiger, 1807 (Opinion 1352) 287
EURHININI Lacordaire, 1866 (Opinion 1352) 287
Eurhinus Illiger, 1807 (Opinion 1352) 287
Eurhinus Schönherr, 1825 (Opinion 1352) 287
eurhostus Sphaenorhynchus, Rivero, 1969 7
EURHYNCHINAE Lacordaire, 1863 (Opinion 1352) 287
Eurhynchus Berthold, 1827 (Opinion 1352) 287
Eurhynchus Kirby, in Kirby & Spence, 1828 (Opinion 1352) 287
exitiosus, Eutermes, Hill, 1925 (Opinion 1310) 154
exunguis, Manatus, Natterer in Diesing, 1839 (Opinion 1320) . . . 175

facchino, Cancer, Herbst, 1785 305
fatima, Papilio, Fabricius, 1793 (Opinion 1339) 255
femorata, Corixa, Guérin-Méneville, 1857 (Opinion 1311) 156
festucae, Myzus, Theobald, 1917 (Opinion 1353) 291
fimbriatus, Stellio, Schneider, 1792 (Opinion 1359) 344
flaviceps, Notiphila, Meigen, 1830 (Opinion 1321) 177
flavopunctata, Hymenolepis, Weinland, 1858 72
flexuosa, Laomedea, Alder, 1857 (Opinion 1345) 271
francispori, Anuropoda, Bacescu, 1980 (Opinion 1357) 338

galeatus, Serresius, Bonaparte, 1855 50
Galeopsomyia Girault, 1916 (Opinion 1351) 285
gaurus, Bos, H. Smith, 1827 (Opinion 1348) 279
Geoemyda Gray, 1834 (Opinion 1309) 152
gigas, Manati, Zimmermann, 1780 (Opinion 1320) 175
glaberrima, Holothuria, Selenka, 1867 219

globosa, Globigerina, Hantken, 1883 (Opinion 1316) 167
Glyphipterix Hübner, [1825] 219
Glyphipteryx Curtis, 1827 220
Glyptus Brullé, 1835 (Opinion 1299) 128
Glyptus Hoffmannsegg, 1818 (Opinion 1299) 128
Gnamptodon Haliday, 1833 101
Gnaptodon Haliday, 1837 102
graeca, Musca, Pontoppidan, 1763 395
granulosa, Hydatigena, Batsch, A.G.C., 1796 74
guttatus, Bodianus, Bloch, 1790 374

Harminius Fairmaire, 1851 (Opinion 1334) 238
HARPIDAE Bronn, 1849 79
HARPIDAE Hawle & Corda, 1847 79
Hatschekia Poche, 1902 57
HATSCHEKIIDAE Kabata (1979) 58
HELIOTHINAE (ex Heliothidi) Boisduval, 1828 (Opinion 1312) 158
Heliothis Ochsenheimer, 1816 (Opinion 1312) 158
hermannii, Chelifer, Audouin, 1826 85
hesperidum, Coccus, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1303) 139
Heterelis Costa, 1887 (Opinion 1293) 29
Heterodera A. Schmidt, 1871 (Opinion 1336) 244
HETEROGYNIDAE Rambur, 1866 385
HETEROGYNINAE Nagy, 1969 385
Heterogynis Rambur, 1837 385
Heterogyna Nagy, 1969 385
Heterolaophonte Lang, 1948 (Opinion 1356) 335
heydenii, Leptinotarsa, Stål, 1858 (Opinion 1290) 21
hippoglossi, Clavella, Krøyer, 1838 58
hirtata, Phalaena, Fabricius, 1794 (Opinion 1362) 351
Holocentropus McLachlan, 1878 (Opinion 1327) 192
humeralis, Notaspis, Hermann, 1804 54
Humerobates Sellnick, 1928 54
Hydrellia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Opinion 1321) 177
HYDRELLIIDAE Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Opinion 1321) 177
Hydrobata Vieillot, 1816 400
Hydrobates Boie, 1822 398
HYDROBATIDAE Degland, 1849 398
HYDROBATIDAE Mathews, 1912 398
Hydrodamalis Retzius, 1794 (Opinion 1320) 175
hydrophilus, Cinclus, Borkhausen, 1797 400
HYDROPHORINAE Lioy, 1864 (or Schiner, 1864) (Opinion 1314) 162
HYMENOLEPIDINAE Perrier, [1896] 73
Hymenolepis Weinland, 1858 72

Ichnotropis Peters, 1854 89
incanus, Curculio, Linnaeus, 1758 299
insignis, Cheirurus, Beyrich, 1845 379
inunguis, Manatus, Natterer in Pelzeln, 1883 (Opinion 1320) 175
IPNOPIDAE Jordan, 1923 (Opinion 1333) 236

johnstoni, Campanularia, Alder, 1856 (Opinion 1345) 271
juglandis, Aphis, Goeze, 1778 (Opinion 1358) 341

Kassina Girard, 1853 (Opinion 1364) 355
kochi, Olpium, Simon, 1881 87
Krizousacorixa Hungerford, 1930 (Opinion 1311) 156

lactea, Hyla, Daudin, 1803 6
lamia, Roeselia, Meigen, 1838 96
Lamprocabera Inoue, 1958 (Opinion 1305) 144
lanceolatus, Belemnites, Schlotheim, 1813 (Opinion 1328) 222
laniaria, Cynochampsa, Owen, 1859 (Opinion 1324) 185
Laomedea Lamouroux, 1812 (Opinion 1345) 271
Laspeyresia Hübner, [1825] 8
latipes, Atractocera, Meigen, 1804 109
Lecanium Burmeister, 1835 139
Ledella Verrill & Bush, 1897 (Opinion 1306) 146
Leo Brehm, 1829 (Opinion 1368) 366
Leptinotarsa Chevrolat, 1837 (Opinion 1290) 21
leptocephalus, Semionotus, Agassiz, 1836 371
leucostoma, Voluta, Gmelin, 1791 (Opinion 1292) 27
LIMENITIDINAE Butler, [12 February, 1870] (Direction 118) 195
limonii, Heterodera, Cooper, 1955 (Opinion 1336) 244
lingua, Mytilus, Lightfoot, 1786 (Opinion 1355) 332
Lingula Bruguière, [1797] (Opinion 1355) 332
lituellum, Siphonium (Dendropoma), Mörch, 1861 48
longicaudatoides, Prodorylaimus, Altherr, 1968 (Opinion 1330) 228
longior, Tyroglyphus, Gervais, 1844 (Opinion 1298) 124
longipalpis, Erigone, Sundevall, 1830 91
lottini, Alpheus, Guérin, 1829 (Opinion 1367) 361
luciae, Sagartia, Verrill, 1898 306
lucida, Yoldia, Lovén, 1896 (Opinion 1306) 146
lunifrontis, Cimex, Cooper, 1870 (Opinion 1360) 347
Lychnoculus Murray, 1877 (Opinion 1333) 236
Lyristes Horváth, 1926 211

macrolepidota, Ichnotropis, Peters, 1854 90
maculatus, Hylambates, Duméril, 1853 (Opinion 1364) 355
Manati Steller, 1774 (Opinion 1320) 175
manni, Austrochilus, Gertsch, in Zapfe, 1955 389
Mayorella Schaeffer, 1926 (Opinion 1344) 269
Melitea Lamouroux, 1812 (Opinion 1304) 142
Melithaea Milne Edwards & Haime, 1857 (Opinion 1304) 142
Melitodes Verrill, 1864 (Opinion 1304) 142
mercenaria, Corixia, Say, 1832 (Opinion 1311) 156
Mesoplodon Gervais, 1850 (Opinion 1289) 19
methwoldensis, Heterodera, Cooper, 1955 (Opinion 1336) 244
Microchrysa Loew, 1855 393
Micropteron Eschricht, 1849 (Opinion 1289) 19
MICROSPORIDAE Reichardt, 1976 (Opinion 1331) 230
Microsporus Kolenati, 1846 (Opinion 1331) 230

Mikropteron Eschricht, 1849 (Opinion 1289) 19
minutissima, Apis, Rossi, 1790 (Opinion 1319) 173
mirabilis, Lychnoculus, Murray, 1877 (Opinion 1333) 236
mixta, Cicada, Fabricius, 1794 (Opinion 1365) 357
morys, Pteromalus, Walker, 1848 (Opinion 1297) 39
mucronata, Hispa, Olivier, 1808 (Opinion 1359) 344
mucronatus, Belemnites, Schlotheim, 1813 (Opinion 1328) 222
murrayi, Ipnops, Günther, 1878 (Opinion 1333) 236
myrmecophilum, Macrosiphum, Theobald, 1916 (Opinion 1353) 291
mytilaspidis, Aphelinus, Le Baron, 1870 214

nana, Buprestis, Paykull, 1799 (non Gmelin, 1790) (Opinion 1322) 180
nebulosus, Hydrophorus, Fallén, 1823 (Opinion 1314) 162
neglectus, Neriene, Pickard-Cambridge, 1871 83
Neodorippe Serène & Romimohtarto, 1969 304
Nephanes Thomson, 1859 (Opinion 1307) 148
Netastoma Carpenter, 1864 (Opinion 1296) 37
Nettastomella Carpenter, 1865 (Opinion 1296) 37
nitidulata, Phalaena, [Hufnagel], 1767 7
Nodus Wagler, 1830 (Opinion 1289) 19
Nomioides Schenck, 1866 (Opinion 1319) 173
nymphaealis, Nymphula, Treitschke, 1829 7
Nymphula Schrank, 1802 7

oaxacae, Kinosternon, Berry & Iverson, 1980 (Opinion 1343) 266
oaxacae, Kinosternon, Pritchard, 1979 (Opinion 1343) 266
obsidianus, Microsporus, Kolenati, 1846 (Opinion 1331) 230
oceanica, Procellaria, Kuhl, 1820 400
Oceanites Keyserling & di Blasius, 1840 399
OCEANITIDAE Forbes, 1882 398
ochracea, Isis, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1304) 142
OLPIIDAE Banks, 1895 86
Olpium L. Koch, 1873 85
Ommateremias Lantz, 1928 (Opinion 1318) 171
otiosus, Attus, Hentz, 1846 (Opinion 1340) 258
ovalis, Pseudoclavella, Bassett-Smith, 1898 57

pallipes, Obisium, Lucas, [1846] 86
Pan Oken, 1816 (Opinion 1368) 365
PANAPHIDINI Oestlund, 1922 (Opinion 1358) 341
Panaphis Kirkaldy, 1904 (Opinion 1358) 341
Panthera Oken, 1816 (Opinion 1368) 365
Papilio Linnaeus, 1758 (Direction 116) 41
papilio, Voluta, Link, 1807 (Opinion 1292) 27
PAPILIONIDAE Latreille, [1802] (Direction 116) 41
Papilionides Latreille, [1802] (Direction 116) 41
paradoxa, Heterogynis, Rambur, 1837 385
pardus, Felis, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1368) 365
Parthenolecanium Šulc, 1908 (Opinion 1303) 139
patagonicus, Adianthus, Ameghino, 1904 107
pavonia, Cythere, Brady, 1866 (Opinion 1346) 274

peculiaris, Thaida, Karsch, 1880 389
pelagica, Procellaria, Linnaeus, 1758 398
Pentacta Goldfuss, 1820 (Opinion 1295) 34
peregrinus, Attus, Walckenaer, 1837 (Opinion 1340) 258
perfoliata, Taenia, Schrank, 1788 77
perforans, Stoa, De Serres, 1855 48
permianus, Tupus, Sellards, 1906 (Opinion 1317) 169
picipes, Byrrhus, Olivier, 1790 (Opinion 1323) 182
pilipennis, Actia, Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 93
pilipennis, Tachina, Fallén, 1810 93
planiceps, Damalis, Fabricius, 1805 (Opinion 1342) 264
polita, Musca, Linnaeus, 1758 393
polygoni, Heterodera, Cooper, 1955 (Opinion 1336) 244
Polygramma Chevrolat, 1837 (Opinion 1290) 21
Porcus Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1808 14
posticata, Phalaena, Fabricius, 1794 (Opinion 1361) 349
Priapus Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1295) 34
Prodorylaimus Andrassy, 1959 (Opinion 1330) 228
protea, Heterogyna, Nagy, 1969 386
Pseudoclavella Bassett-Smith, 1898 57
Pseudocorymbites Fiori, 1898 (Opinion 1334) 238
Pseudonevermannia Baranov, 1926 121
Ptinella Motschulsky, 1844 (Opinion 1307) 148
pulcher, Attus, Walckenaer, 1837 (Opinion 1340) 258
pulcher pallida, Attus, Walckenaer, 1837 (Opinion 1340) 258
pumilio, Bracon Nees, 1834 101
punctularia, Testudo, Daudin, 1801 (Opinion 1309) 152
pura, Xenocrepis, Mayr, 1904 (Opinion 1297) 39
putrescentiae, Acarus, Schrank, 1781 (Opinion 1298) 124

quadripunctatus, Cimex, Fabricius, 1794 (Opinion 1326) 190
quadripunctatus, Cimex, Villers, 1789 (Opinion 1326) 190
quadripunctatus, Lygaeus, Fabricius, 1794 (Opinion 1326) 190
quarlesi, Anoa, Ouwens, 1910 (Opinion 1349) 281
quinquecincta, Scolia, Fabricius, 1793 (Opinion 1293) 29

redimacula, Agrotis, Morrison, 1874 (Opinion 1354) 330
redimicula, Agrotis, Morrison, 1874 (Opinion 1354) 330
R. Forsteri, Columba, Wagler, 1929 50
Rhabditis Dujardin, [Nov. 1844] 197
Rhinoclemmys Fitzinger, 1835 (Opinion 1309) 152
riparia, Ephydra, Fallén, 1813 (Opinion 1321) 177
Robertus O. Pickard-Cambridge, 1879 81
rostrolamellatus, Humerobates, Grandjean, 1936 54
rufa, Thrips (Aptinothrips), Haliday, 1836 (Opinion 1338) 251
rubra, Nepa, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1335) 241
rufipes, Byrrhus, Kugelann, 1792 (Opinion 1323) 182
rufus, Thrips (Aptinothrips), Haliday, 1836 (Opinion 1338) 251
rufus, Thrips, Haliday, 1836 (Opinion 1338) 251

sachalinensis, Mactra, Schrenk, 1862 (Opinion 1366) 359
salinus, Cancer, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1301) 134
salmachus, Sphinx, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1288) 17
savignyi, Olpium, Simon, 1879 85
scabrior, Eurhinus, Kirby, 1819 (Opinion 1352) 287
schoenherri, Anthalia, Zetterstedt, 1838 (Opinion 1347) 277
scripta, Testudo, Schoepff, 1792 (Opinion 1313) 160
sculptilis, Glyptus, Brullé, 1835 (Opinion 1299) 128
Selkirkia Walcott, 1911 (Opinion 1337) 249
Semionotus Agassiz, 1832 371
semistriatus, Byrrhus, Fabricius, 1794 (Opinion 1323) 182
sexmaculata, Cephalopholis (Rüppell, 1830) 374
Simplocaria Stephens, 1829 (Opinion 1323) 182
soemmeringii, Aeolidiella, Bergh, 1882 (Opinion 1315). 165
soemmerringii, Eolida, Leuckart, 1828 (Opinion 1315). 165
Southernia Allgén, 1929 200
Southernia Filipjev, 1927 200
spengleri, Testudo, Gmelin, 1789 (Opinion 1309) 152
SPHAERIIDAE Erichson, 1845 (Opinion 1331) 230
SPHAERIIDAE Jeffreys, 1862 (1820) (Opinion 1331). 230
Sphaerium Scopoli, 1777 (Direction 117) 43
Sphaerius Waltl, 1838 (Opinion 1331) 230
spiniger, Althous, Candèze, 1860 (Opinion 1334) 238
Spiroglyphus Daudin, 1800 46
spirulaeformis, Stoa, De Serres, 1855 48
stelleri, Hydrodamalis, Retzius, 1794 (Opinion 1320) 175
Stoa De Serres, 1855 46
stroemii, Cyclops, Baird, 1837 (Opinion 1367) 335
sublucanus, Cancer, Forskål, 1775 (Opinion 1367) 361
sybillae, Mactra, Valenciennes, 1858 (Opinion 1366) 359

teguixin, Lacerta, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1300) 130
TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 (Opinion 1300) 130
Teius Merrem, 1820 (Opinion 1300) 130
terricola, Rhabditis, Dujardin, [Nov. 1844] 197
tetragonus, Diademodon, Seeley, 1894 (Opinion 1324) 185
teyou, Lacerta, Daudin, 1802 (Opinion 1300) 130
Thaida Karsch, 1880 389
THAIDIDAE Jousseaume, 1888 389
THAIDIDAE Lehtinen, 1967 389
THAISIDAE Jousseaume, 1888 390
THALASSIDROMIDAE J.W. von Müller, 1865 398
Thalassidroma Vigors, 1825 399
Theranthropus Brookes, 1828 (Opinion 1368) 367
Thermophilus Fitzinger, 1843 89
Thylacites Germar, 1817 296
THYLACITINAE Kirby, 1837 299
TIBICENIDAE Van Duzee, 1916 211
Tibicina Amyot, 1847 211
TIBICININAE Distant, 1916 212
Tigris Oken, 1816 (Opinion 1368) 367

tiliae, Coccus, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1303) 139
tipuliformis, Sphinx, Clerck, 1759 (Opinion 1288) 17
tisboides, Dactylopus, Claus, 1863 (Opinion 1356) 355
Titan Matthews, 1858 (Opinion 1307) 148
titan, Trichopteryx, Newman, 1834 (Opinion 1307). 148
tolteca, Stenoderma, Saussure, 1860. 302
toltecus toltecus, Artibeus, (Saussure, 1860) 303
Tornatellina Pfeiffer, 1842 199
Trichaporus Foerster, 1856 (Opinion 1351) 285
Trichoporus Ashmead, 1900 (Opinion 1351) 285
tricolor, Encarsia, Foerster, 1878 (Opinion 1351) 285
trilineata, Musca, Linnaeus, 1767 395
troglodytes, Homo, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1368). 367
tropicalis, Globigerina, Blow & Banner, 1962 (Opinion 1316) . . . 167
TUPINAMBIDAE Gray, 1825 (Opinion 1300). 131
Tupinambis Daudin, 1802 (Opinion 1300). 130
Tupus Sellards, 1906 (Opinion 1317) 169
TYPIDAE Handlirsch, 1919 (Opinion 1317). 169
Typus Sellards, 1909 (Opinion 1317) 169
TYROPHAGIDAE Oudemans, 1924 (Opinion 1298). 124
Tyrophagus Oudemans, 1924 (Opinion 1298). 124

UROPLATIIDAE Boulenger, 1884 (Opinion 1359) 344
UROPLATINI Leng, 1920 (Opinion 1359) 344
Uroplata Chevrolat, 1835 (Opinion 1359) 344
Uroplatus Duméril, 1806 (Opinion 1359) 344
urticae, Heterodera, Cooper, 1955 (Opinion 1336) 244

vagans, Erigone, Audouin, 1826 91
velox, Lacerta, Pallas, 1771 (Opinion 1318) 171
ventricosa, Emys, Gray, 1855 (Opinion 1313). 160
vernum, Simulium, Macquart, 1826 121
vetusta, Phryganeolitha, Germar, 1813 (Opinion 1327) 192
vicarius, Oeciacus, Horváth, 1912 (Opinion 1360) 347
vinetella, Tinea, Fabricius, 1787 84
volubilis, Sertularia, Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 1345) 271

Xenocrepis Foerster, 1856 (Opinion 1297). 39

Yoldiella Verrill & Bush, 1897 (Opinion 1306) 146

zanana, Serranus, Valenciennes, 1828 376
zebra, Antilope, Gray, 1838 (Opinion 1291) 24
zebrata, Antilope, Robert, 1836 (Opinion 1291) 24
zosterae, Southernia, Allgén, 1929 200

CORRIGENDA

Vol. 42, part 2

page 121, line 36	for 'Caetha' read 'Cnetha'.
page 121, line 37	for 'Official List . . .' read 'Official Index of Rejected and Invalid . . .'

PARTICULARS OF DATES OF PUBLICATION OF THE SEVERAL PARTS IN WHICH THE PRESENT VOLUME WAS PUBLISHED

Part No.	*Contents of Part (pages)*	*Date of Publication*
1	1–98	2 April 1985
2	99–204	27 June 1985
3	205–310	30 September 1985
4	311–420	6 December 1985

INSTRUCTIONS TO BINDER

The present volume should be bound up as follows:
T.P. I–VII, 1–420

Note: The wrappers (covers) of the four parts should be bound in at the end of the volume.

THAIDIDAE Jousseaume, 1888 (Mollusca, Gastropoda) and THAIDIDAE Lehtinen, 1967 (Arachnida, Araneae). P.T. Lehtinen. 389
Drasterius bimaculatus (Rossi, 1790) (Insecta, Coleoptera, Elateridae). M. Mroczkowski 391
Microchrysa Loew, 1855 (Insecta, Diptera). E.P. Nartshuk & R. Rozkošný 393
Musca trilineata Linnaeus, 1767 (Insecta, Diptera). E.P. Nartshuk & R. Rozkošný 395
Family names for the storm petrels and dippers. R.V. Melville 398

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature wishes to express its appreciation of the facilities provided by the Trustees of the British Museum (Natural History) for the Secretariat of the Commission.

CONTENTS

Page

Officers and Members of the Commission vii
Members of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature . . . viii
Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology 311
Special Announcements 312
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature: General Meeting, Budapest, 2–6 September, 1985 313
Financial Report for 1984 323

Comment

Comment on proposed amendment of Article 71b of Code. W.D.L. Ride 327

Opinions

Opinion 1354. *Agrotis redimicula* Morrison, 1874 (Lepidoptera) . . . 330
Opinion 1355. *Lingula anatina* Lamarck, 1801 (Brachiopoda) 332
Opinion 1356. *Dactylopusia* Norman, 1903 (Crustacea, Copepoda) . . 335
Opinion 1357. ANUROPODIDAE Bacescu, 1980 and ANUROPODIDAE Stebbing, 1893 (Crustacea) 338
Opinion 1358. *Calaphis* Walsh, 1862 and *Callaphis* Walker, 1870 (Insecta, Hemiptera) 341
Opinion 1359. UROPLAT- as the stem of family-group names in Reptilia, Sauria and Insecta, Coleoptera 344
Opinion 1360. *Oeciacus vicarius* Horváth, 1912 (Insecta, Hemiptera) . . 347
Opinion 1361. *Larentia capitata* Herrich-Schaeffer, 1839 and *Phalaena posticata* Fabricius, 1794 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) 349
Opinion 1362. *Phalaena coracina* Esper, 1805 and *Phalaena hirtata* Fabricius, 1794 (Insecta, Lepidoptera) 351
Opinion 1363. *Ancistroceroides* Saussure, 1855 (Insecta, Hymenoptera) . 353
Opinion 1364. *Kassina* Girard, 1853 (Amphibia, Anura) 355
Opinion 1365. *Allygus* Fieber, 1872 (Insecta, Homoptera) 357
Opinion 1366. *Mactra sachalinensis* Schrenk, 1862 (Mollusca, Bivalvia) . 359
Opinion 1367. *Alpheus lottini* Guérin, 1829 (Crustacea, Decapoda) . . 361
Opinion 1368. *Pan* and *Panthera* Oken, 1816 (Mammalia, Carnivora) . 365

New and revived cases

Semionotus Agassiz, 1832 (Osteichthyes). A.R. McCune 371
Cephalopholis argus Schneider, 1801 and *Cephalopholis sexmaculata* (Rüppell, 1830) (Osteichthyes, Serranidae). J.E. Randall, M.L. Bauchot, A. Ben-Tuvia & P.C. Heemstra 374
Cheirurus Beyrich, 1845 (Trilobita). P.D. Lane 379
Eugynothrips Priesner, 1926 and *Cryptothrips conocephali* Karny, 1913 (Insecta, Thysanoptera). D.J. Brothers & L.A. Mound 382
HETEROGYNIDAE Rambur, 1866 and HETEROGYNIDAE Nagy, 1969 (Insecta). M.C. Day 385
Request for ruling that French theses submitted for *Docteur du Troisième Cycle* are not published. G.C. Hewitt & V. Rousset. 387

Printed in Great Britain by Henry Ling Ltd., at the Dorset Press, Dorchester, Dorset